

amph.
Lat. lit.
R.

Ruggie

"IGNORAMUS"

COMŒDIA CORAM REGIA MAIESTATE
JACOBI REGIS ANGLIAE

(by George Ruggie)

AN EXAMINATION OF ITS SOURCES AND LITERARY
INFLUENCE WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ITS
RELATION TO BUTLER'S "HUDIBRAS"

BY

JUSTIN LOOMIS VAN GUNDY

by George Ruggie
"

AN INAUGURAL DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE PHILOSOPHICAL FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY
AT JENA IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA.
1906

22

“IGNORAMUS”

COMŒDIA CORAM REGIA MAIESTATE
JACOBI REGIS ANGLIAE

AN EXAMINATION OF ITS SOURCES AND LITERARY
INFLUENCE WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ITS
RELATION TO BUTLER'S “HUDIBRAS”

BY

JUSTIN LOOMIS VAN GUNDY

AN INAUGURAL DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE PHILOSOPHICAL FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY
AT JENA IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Genehmigt von der philosophischen Fakultät der Universität
Jena auf Antrag des Herrn Professor Dr. Keller.

Jena, den 15. Juli 1905.

Geheimer Hofrat Professor Dr. **Thomae**,
z. Zt. Dekan.

CONTENTS.

I.	MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS	1
II.	REPRESENTATIONS	5
III.	MOTIVES AND PURPOSES.....	10
IV.	FORM AND LANGUAGE.....	19
V.	SOURCES:	
	(a) Comparison of	23
	(b) Summary of	59
VI.	LITERARY INFLUENCE.	
	1. Poems in Praise of Ignoramus.....	65
	2. Writings in Censure of Ignoramus.....	66
	3. Translation and Adaptation	68
	4. Schioppius and Dr. Ignoramus.....	69
	5. Butler's Hudibras.—Its Relation to Ignoramus and other Sources	71
	(a) Sources for Hudibras formerly proposed.....	71
	(b) Ignoramus a Source for Hudibras.....	72
	(c) General Characteristics common to Ignoramus and Hudibras	73
	(d) Comparison of Characters and Incidents.....	75
	(e) Unclassified Episodes	
	(f) Commentary upon Sources other than Ignoramus	91
	(g) Summary of Influences from Ignoramus and other Sources	95
VII.	APPENDIX.	
	1. Account of King James' First Visit to Cambridge..	99
	2. Account of King James' Second Visit to Cambridge	101
	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR.....	105

I. MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS.

MANUSCRIPTS.

Of the drama *Ignoramus* seven MSS. are preserved at Cambridge, Oxford and in the British Museum. Of these one is in the library of Clare Hall, Cambridge. This MS. is incomplete. The librarian of Clare Hall informs me that the note of Mr. Hawkins in reference to its imperfections (Hawkins' Edit. *Igno.*, p. lxxiv, note d)¹ is quite correct. He adds that the MS. bears neither name, date or number. Two MSS. are extant in the British Museum, one among the Harleian collections No. 6869, and one in the Sloane collections, No. 2531. There are also three in the Bodleian library at Oxford, namely Douce, No. 43, Tanner, No. 306, and Rawl. D. 1361. In connection with the last named MS. there stands in the catalogue the following comment, which the librarian has kindly copied and sent me: "Very neatly written. It bears this note of original ownership: 'Richard Garrard of Southwold owns this booke,' afterwards it belonged to Archbishop Sancroft, and as it contains a list of the persons originally acting the play, is doubtless the copy from which he took the list inserted by him in his copy of the first printed edition, now in the library of Emanuel College. (See J. S. Hawkins' ed., 1787, p. xxii, a.) It has the mistake of Barges for the name Bargrave." The MS. bears date of 1629.²

¹ See full title of this edition below, p. 3.

² According to the note of Mr. Hawkins referred to above, it becomes evident that he derived his names of the actors from Sancroft's copy of the first printed edition and not from Bodl. MS. Rawl. D. 1361. It is therefore almost certain that Hawkins did not consult this MS. for the publication of his edition; and since he makes no reference to any of the Oxford MSS., it is probable that he was ignorant of all of them, despite the fact that he speaks of having consulted all the MSS.

EDITIONS.

The assignment of the copyright of our drama is recorded in the books of the stationers as follows:

“ 30 June 1630

“ John Spencer, assigned over to him by Mrs. Bur, by a note under her hand, and consent of Mr. Purfoot, warden, the copies following.” Seventh in the list stands “ Ignoramus.”

The first edition of Ignoramus was printed in the year 1630 under the title, “ Ignoramus. Comoedia coram Regia Majestate Jacobi Regis Angliae, etc. Londini, Impensis J. S. 1630.” Copies of this edition are still to be found in the main libraries of Cambridge and Oxford, and in the British Museum. One copy, preserved in the library of Emanuel College, Cambridge, deserves special note, as having been the property of Archbishop Sancroft, who collected this copy with three MSS. and the printed edition of 1658.¹

A second edition was published in the same year, 1630, and has upon the title-page in addition to what stood upon that of the first edition the following: “ Secunda editio auctior et emendatior. Una cum argumentis unicuique Scaenae prae-positis, ut melius totius fabulae scopus, qui aliter obscurior est, intelligatur,” with the press-mark: “ Londini; Typis T. H. Sumptibus G. E. et J. S. 1630.” Copies of this edition are preserved at Cambridge, Oxford, in the British Museum, and in the library of the English Seminar at Jena.

A third edition was published in the year 1658, under the title, “ Ignoramus. Comoedia coram Rege Jacobo et totius Angliae Magnatibus per Academicos Cantabrigienses habita. Editio tertia, locis sexcentis emendatior, cum eorum supplemento, quae causidicorum municipalium reverentia, haecenus desiderabantur. Auctore M^{ro}. Ruggle. Aulae clarensis A. M. Loudini ex offic. R. D. An. 1658.” Copies of this edition are to be found at Cambridge, Oxford, and in the British Museum.

An edition, which bears the mark of “ Editio quarta ” and

¹ Hawkins edit. Igno., p. 73 note.

which we designate 4th Edition A, was printed in the year following the third edition, namely, 1659. A copy of this edition is preserved at Cambridge, in the general library.

Another edition or reprint, which is also marked *Editio quarta*, but which we designate 4th Edition B, bears date of 1668. The title of this edition is the same as that of the third edition. The press-mark is *Loudini ex offic.* J. R. An. 1668. It is worthy of note that at the end after the Epilogue is this statement: "*excudebat J. R. 1670.*" Copies of this edition are preserved at Oxford and in the British Museum.

An edition, which we designate 5th Edition A, appeared with the statement, "*Editio quinta a MSS. emendatior*" with press-mark *Impensis G. S.,* but without any date. A copy of this edition is preserved at Oxford.

Another fifth edition, which we designate 5th Edition B, appeared at London with two title pages, one of which is the same as that of 5th Edition A; the second bears the same press-mark G. S. and the date 1707. A copy of this edition is preserved in the British Museum.

A sixth edition bears the press-mark "*Westmonasterii MDCCXXXI.*" Copies of this edition are to be found at Cambridge, Oxford, and in the British Museum.

An edition named the seventh has the press-mark "*Dublinii MDCCXXXVI.*" A copy of this edition is preserved in the British Museum.

Another edition, without number, but which may be called the eighth, appeared at Westminster in the year 1737. Copies of the same are to be found at Cambridge, Oxford, and in the British Museum.

An edition without number, but which may be designated the ninth, was edited by Mr. J. S. Hawkins, with critical and historical notes, together with a sketch of the author's life, and much other historical material, and was printed at London in the year 1787. The title reads as follows: *Ignoramus | Comœdia | scriptore | Georgio Ruggle, A.M. | aulae Clarensis, apud Cantabrigienses | olim socio: | nunc denuo | in lucem edita | cum | notis historicis et criticis: | quibus insuper | praeponitur*

vita auctoris, | et | subjicitur glossarium | vocabula forensia |
dilucide exponens: | accurante | Johanne Sidneio Hawkins,
Arm. | Londini: | prostat venalis apud T. Payne | et Filium,
bibliopolas: | necnon gul. ginger juxta scholam | regiam West-
monasteriensem | MDCCLXXXVII. Copies are preserved at
Cambridge, Oxford, in the British Museum and elsewhere.

An abbreviated edition also appeared at London in the year
1763, a copy of which is preserved at Oxford.

II. REPRESENTATIONS.

Special interest and importance are connected with the first and second representation of our drama through the fact that both presentations were given within a short time of each other for the delectation of King James I. Probably from the time that the king made his first progress towards the capital, when at Hinchbrook he promised the heads of the university his favor, had Cambridge scholars hoped for a visit from his Royal Majesty. After twelve years of vain expectancy and after the king had in the meanwhile paid two visits to Oxford, one in 1605, and another in 1614, Cambridge men were emboldened to send his majesty through their distinguished, newly-chosen chancellor, Thomas Howard, Earl of Suffolk, and Lord Treasurer of England, an invitation to grace also Cambridge with his royal presence. (Baker's MSS. collections, British Museum, Vol. XII, p. 159.)¹ This visit being urged also by Carr, the earl of Somerset, the king graciously accepted the invitation and promised to make the visit between Christmas and the following Shrovetide, 1614-15. (Sir Fulke Greville's "Five Years of King James," edit. 4to, 1643, p. 60.)² However because of the great snow-storms of that winter and the inclemency of the weather the king and his train did not arrive in Cambridge until the seventh of March. (Hawkins' edit. Ignoramus, pp. xxv-xxvi.)

A program of the evening entertainments provided for the king's visit is as follows:

On Tuesday, the 7th of March 1614 (15), was acted before the king in Trinity College hall,

1. *Amelia*, a Latin comedy made by Mr. Cecil Johannis.

On Wednesday night,

2. *Ignoramus*, the lawyer, Latine, and part English, composed by Mr. Ruggle, Clarendis.

¹ Quoted by Hawkins edit. *Ignoramus*, p. xx, n. a.

² Quoted by Hawkins edit. *Ignoramus*, p. xx, n. a.

On Thursday,

3. Albumazar, the astronomer, in English, by Mr. Tomkis. Trinit.

On Friday,

4. Melanthe, a Latin pastoral, made by Mr. Brookes (mox doctor) Trinitatis.

On the next Monday,

5. The Piscatory, an English comedy, was acted before the university in King's college, which Master Fletcher, of that college had provided, if the king should have tarried another night. (*Gentleman's Mag.*, May, 1756, p. 223.)¹

The first presentation of "Ignoramus" was given, therefore, on the evening of the eighth of March, 1615, the day following the king's arrival in Cambridge. Brief accounts of the royal visit are found in Howes' "Abridgement of Stow's Chronicle," edit. 8vo, 1618, and in the continuation of Stow's "Chronicle," edit. 1631, p. 1023.² The fullest and most satisfactory narrative of the events of the king's first visit, as well as of his entertainment on that occasion, is derived from a letter of Mr. John Chamberlain, an eye witness of all that passed during the visit, addressed to Sir Dudley Carleton, at Turin. I have deemed this account of sufficient interest to be reprinted in an appendix hereto. Though the account, which Mr. Chamberlain gives of our comedy, is by no means extravagant in praise of it, or indeed of anything he witnessed; yet we have ample other evidence, that its performance was a marked success, and gave the king the utmost pleasure. Of this indeed the best witness is the fact that within a little more than two months after the first presentation, the king made another visit to Cambridge, for the pleasure of seeing Ignoramus enacted a second time.

Says one record: "The king hath a meaning and speaks much of it, to go again privately, to see two of the plays, and hath appointed the 27th of the next month; but it is not likely he will continue in that mind; for of late he hath made a motion to have the actors come hither, which will be a difficult thing to persuade some of them, being preachers and bachelors of

¹ Quoted by Hawkins edit. *Igno.*, p. xxx.

² Quoted by Hawkins edit. *Igno.*, p. xlv, n. c.

divinity, to become players any where but in the university." (Birch MSS. collections, Brit. Mus., March, 1615.)¹

Another account says: "His majesty was much delighted with the play, and laughed exceedingly; and oftentimes, with his hands, and by words, applauded it." (Account of the king's second visit, reprinted in appendix hereto.) Sir Edward Coke, lord chief justice, who himself was very much hurt by this satire upon his profession says of it: "Never did any thing so hit the king's humor as this play did, so that he would have it acted again and again; which was increased with several additions, which yet more pleased the king (Detection of the Court and State of England, 3rd, edit., 8vo, 1697, Vol. I, p. 74)."²

The second presentation of the comedy Ignoramus took place Saturday evening, the 13th of May, 1615, and, as we have seen above, pleased the king, if possible, even more than the first enactment.³ The effect produced upon the rest of the audience by our drama was various. We may believe that the large majority of the audience laughed with the king; but the lawyers and possibly certain Catholics, Puritans, and Oxford scholars, who were present or heard of it, took great offense at this portraiture of the time and its usages, and old animosities and jealousies were rekindled and fanned into a blaze.

Several records give us some idea of the sensation produced, both at Cambridge and elsewhere, by the first two presentations. One is as follows: "And we are told that between the scholars of the university and the common lawyers it occasioned so great a disturbance that the insults of the former became intolerable; and to such a height had these tumults risen, as to require the interposition of the lord chancellor to quell them; which by explaining the author's intention was at length effected." (Sir Fulke Greville's "Five Years of King James, 4to, 1643, p. 60.)"⁴ Another interesting description of the situation appears in still another letter of the afore-mentioned

¹ Quoted by Hawkins edit. *Ignor.*, p. xli, n. a.

² Quoted by Hawkins edit. *Ignor.*, p. xxxix, n. a.

³ See account of King's second visit, Appendix II.

⁴ Quoted by Hawkins edit. *Ignor.*, p. xl.

Mr. Chamberlain, dated May 20, 1615. "On Saturday last the king went again to Cambridge, to see the play Ignoramus, which hath so nettled the lawyers, that they are almost out of all patience; and the lord chief justice [Sir Edward Coke] both openly and at the king's bench, and divers other places, hath galled and glanced at scholars with much bitterness: and there be divers inns-of-court men have made rhymes and ballads against them, which they have answered sharply enough: and to say truth, it was a scandal rather taken than given; for what profession is there wherein some particular persons may not be justly taxed without imputation to the whole? But it is the old saying, *consciens ipse sibi*; and they are too partial to think themselves so *sacro-sancti* that they may not be touched. The king had a Latin sermon on Sunday and disputations on Monday before his coming away" (Birch MSS. collections).¹

The distribution of characters, as they were in all probability in the first two performances of our drama, is given in Bodleian MS. Rawl. D. 1361. It has also been inserted with a pen opposite the characters of the *dramatis personae*, in what is known as Archbishop Sancroft's copy of the play, now at Cambridge in the library of Emanuel College and reproduced by Mr. Baker in his Manuscript collections, Brit. Mus., Vol. XV, p. 479. They are as follows:

Theodorus, Mercator, senex, Mr. Hutchinson, Clare Hall.

Antonius, filius Theodori, juvenis, Mr., afterwards Lord, Holles, Christ College.

Ignoramus, Anglus causidicus, Mr. Parkinson, Clare Hall.

<i>Dulman</i>	} <i>clerici</i> {	Mr. Towers, Queen's College, afterwards
<i>Musaeus</i>		Bishop of Peterborough.
<i>Pecus</i>		Mr. Perient, Clare Hall.
		Mr. Parker, Clare Hall.

Torcol, Portugallus, leno, Mr. Bargrave, Clare Hall, afterwards Dean of Canterbury.

Rosabella, virgo, Mr. Morgan, Queen's College.

Surda, nana, ancilla, Mr. Compton, Queen's College, afterwards Earl of Northampton.

¹ Quoted by Hawkins edit. *Igno.*, p. xlv, n. c.

Trico, Theodori Servus, Mr. Lake, afterwards Secretary of State, Clare Hall.

Bannacar, Theodori Servus, Maurus, Dominus Love, Clare Hall.

Cupes, bibliopola, parasitus, Mr. Mason, Pembroke Hall.

Polla, Cupis uxor, Dominus Chesham, Clare Hall.

Cola, monachus, frater, Mr. Wake, Gonville and Caius College.

Dorothea, uxor Theodori, matrona, Norfolk, Queen's College.

Vince, a page, Dorotheae puer, Mr. Compton, Queen's College.

Nell, Angla, Dorotheae ancilla, Turner, Clare Hall.

Richardus, Theodori servus, Grame, Clare Hall.

Pyropus, vestiarius, Mr. Wake, Gonville and Caius College.

Fidicen or Tibicen, Rinnarde, Clare Hall.

Nautae { *Gallicus*, Thorogood, Clare Hall.

{ *Anglicus*, Mr. Mason, Pembroke Hall.

Caupo, Mr. Thorogood, Clare Hall.

ACTORS OF THE FIRST PROLOGUE.

Cursor, Mr. Compton.

Equiso, Mr. Mason.

Musarum Caballus, viz., Davus Dromo, Mr. Lake.

From the date of the second performance we have no record of Ignoramus being placed again upon the stage for nearly one hundred years; although within that interval it had passed through at least six reprints. However at Christmas, 1712, it was enacted on three consecutive evenings by the scholars of Westminster, and again just before Christmas, 1713, there were three presentations of it at the same school. It was also on two subsequent occasions used by the Westminster scholars, as a means of Christmas merriment, namely in 1730 and 1747. On both of these occasions there were, by special request of the audience, four presentations of it instead of three as formerly. In 1731 it was enacted at St. Edmund's Bury, in Suffolk, and in 1763, in an abridged form, it was enacted at Merchant Taylor's school. Ravenscroft's adaptation, "The English Lawyer," was performed at the Royal Theatre in London, 1678.¹

¹ Cf. Hawkins, edit. *Igno.*, p. lxxxvi, notes a and b; Ward's *Eng. Dram. Lit.*, Vol. II, p. 368, and *Dict. Nat. Biog.* under Ruggle.

III. MOTIVES AND PURPOSES.

As the primary motive for the composition of the drama before us, J. S. Hawkins in the introduction to his edition of *Ignoramus*, Fleay in his *Chronicle of the English Drama*, and others assign a dispute which as they say arose about the beginning of the year 1611, as to whether the mayor of Cambridge or the vice chancellor of the university were entitled in certain cases to precedence. It is further stated, that in the conduct of the suit resulting from this controversy, a certain Francis Brackyn, a common lawyer and at that time recorder of Cambridge, took such an active part on behalf of the mayor, that he incurred the bitter odium of the vice chancellor and his friends; and that for this reason he was ridiculed by Ruggle in the character of *Ignoramus*. A. W. Ward in his *History of English Dramatic Literature*, edit. 1875, expresses practically the same sentiment, but in the recent edition of his work, he speaks of the strife between mayor and vice chancellor as being older than 1611, and yet seems to imply that the drama was composed designedly for the entertainment of the king and that within a short time previous to his first visit to Cambridge. He says: "He it was," referring to Brackyn, "whom, for the delectation of King James on an unexpected royal visit to Cambridge, the ingenious Ruggle resolved to make the hero of a Latin comedy."¹ It is indeed certain that Brackyn was, justly or unjustly, taken as the model for *Ignoramus*; yet Ruggle's purpose was certainly more comprehensive than the ridicule of a single individual. Musaeus says, act. II., sc. 6, "*possem, si opus, infinitos celebrare ordinis hujus viros.*" Mr. J. B. Mul-

¹ There is nothing in the comedy itself which gives any clue to the time of composition or the length of time used in its preparation. The only clue which I have found is in the *Essays of John Stephens*, 2d edit., p. 31, where he says: "Who cannot lay matter in two years for a ragged play?" Even if this two years be those immediately preceding the first performance of *Ignoramus* in 1615, the causes which called forth the comedy were not limited to that time.

linger in his History of Cambridge University has shown that this contention as to supremacy of mayor or vice chancellor had on several previous occasions been disputed, and already in the year 1601 decided by the Earl of Essex in favor of the vice chancellor; and also that strife between the town and university was chronic: and further that Brackyn had, for years first as deputy recorder and later as recorder of Cambridge, taken an active interest in these controversies.¹ We may believe therefore that earlier events incident to this strife exerted as great, possibly greater influence upon the composition of Ruggle's drama than the contest of 1611. At any rate there are several pieces of literature, which in their relation to Cambridge life and our author must not be neglected, to be taken into consideration. As early as the year 1598, the same year in which Ruggle became a fellow of Clare Hall, there was enacted at this same college a drama entitled, "Club Law," the authorship of which is generally accredited to Ruggle's hand, and of which Fuller, in his University of Cambridge (edit. 1840, p. 218), gives the following interesting account:

"The young scholars, conceiving themselves somewhat wronged by the townsmen (the particulars whereof I know not), betook them for revenge to their wits, as the weapon wherein lay their best advantage. These, having gotten a discovery of some town-privacies from Mr. Goldsborough, one of their own corporation, composed a merry (but abusive) comedy (which they called "Club Law"), in English, as calculated for the capacities of such, whom they intended spectators thereof. Clare Hall was the place wherein it was acted; and the mayor, with his brethren, and their wives, were invited to behold it, or rather themselves abused therein. A convenient place was assigned to the townfolk (riveted in with scholars on all sides), where they might see and be seen. Here they did behold themselves in their own best clothes (which the scholars had borrowed), so lively personated, their habits, gestures, language, lieger-jests, and expressions, that it was hard

¹ See Univ. of Camb., Vol. I, 374; 627: Vol. II, 3-7; 429-431; 441-447; 526-527: also Hawkins edit Igno., p. xiii, and note b.

to decide which was the true townsman, whether he that sat by, or he who acted on the stage. Sit still they could not for chafing, go out they could not for crowding, but, impatiently patient, were fain to attend till dismissed at the end of the comedy. The mayor and his brethren soon after complain of this libellous play to the lords of the Privy Council, and truly aggravate the scholar's offence, as if the mayor's mace could not be played with but that the sceptre itself is touched therein. Now, though such the gravity of the lords, as they must maintain magistracy, and not behold it abused: yet such their goodness, they would not with too much severity punish wit, though waggishly employed; and therefore only sent some slight and private check to the principal actors therein. There goeth a tradition, many earnestly engaging for the truth thereof, that the townsmen, not contented herewith, importunately pressed, that some more severe and public punishment might be inflicted upon them. Hereupon, the lords promised in short time to come to Cambridge; and, because the life in such things is lacking when only read, they themselves would see the same comedy, with all the properties thereof, acted over again (the townsmen, as formerly, being enjoined to be present thereat), that so they might the better proportion the punishment to the fault, if any appeared. But rather than the townsmen would be witnesses again to their own abusing (wherein many things were too far from—and some things too near to—truth) they fairly fell off from any farther prosecution of the matter."

From the fact that in this drama, the language of the townsmen was ridiculed, as also from the title itself, we may infer that it was a play in purpose and character similar to Ignoramus. Moreover it is asserted that the same Francis Brackyn referred to above, and who at this time was deputy-recorder of Cambridge, was also in "Club Law" one of the leading characters ridiculed.¹ We may be sure therefore that the performance of "Club Law," together with the incidents of Cambridge life preceding and following it must have produced a

¹ Hawkins edit. *Ignoramus*, p. xiii, note b. Macray, edit. *Return from Parnassus*, p. vi. Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, Vol. II, p. 526

deep impression upon the young author, and in all likelihood influenced materially the composition of *Ignoramus*, performed some sixteen years later.

There was also performed at St. John's College between the years 1597 and 1601 a series of three plays entitled, "*The Pilgrimage to Parnassus*" and "*The Return from Parnassus*," in two parts. In these three dramas is reflected distinctly the discontent of the scholar and the contemptuous feelings mutually existing between him and the common civilian. Moreover through the scathing satire, in the third and fourth acts of the last of this series, poured out upon the head of the recorder, again said to be Francis Brackyn; and, moreover, by reason of the fact that these dramas are copiously interspersed with Latin as well as by reason of passages in *Ignoramus* which suggest influence from these dramas; it becomes evident that particularly the last part of the *Return from Parnassus* has in purpose, character and form (and might it be also in authorship) a close kinship with the drama *Ignoramus*. In 1601, the same year in which the last of the trilogy of plays, mentioned above, was performed at St. John's, the townsmen drew up a formal statement of their grievances, wherein they speak of being abused on the stage (see Mullinger's *Hist. of Camb.*, Vol. II, p. 442), and in the year 1604 King James sent a royal letter to Cambridge, forbidding the enactment within five miles of the town, among other games, "Common plays, public shews, interludes, comedies and tragedies in the English tongue." (Mullinger, *Univ. of Camb.*, Vol. II, p. 429.) May it not be primarily these early events and this royal letter, that determined Ruggle to give his efforts to the writing of a Latin Satire?

Thus far we have gone upon the assumption that the strife between Cambridge scholars and Cambridge townsmen furnished the prompting motive for the writing of our drama. It is indeed probable, almost certain, that there is present in this work, as also there was in "*Club Law*" and the "*Return from Parnassus*," a purpose to bring into ridicule those of the community who had long been annoying or obnoxious to the mem-

bers of the university: yet there were certainly present in the mind of our author also weightier and worthier motives than that of simple resentment. That it was not taken merely as a personal satire is evidenced by the general resentment and numerous retorts which its first two performances are said to have called forth from the profession as a whole. (Letter, of Mr. Chamberlain, see above, p. 8.) At the close of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth there was waging at the universities a bitter strife between the advocates of the civil law and those of the common or statute law of England. King James and the majority of the clergy were known to have strong predilection for the Roman law. The king is said on one occasion to have shaken his fist in the face of Lord Chief-Justice Coke, because the latter ventured to assert that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction was a foreign one. (Mullinger, Univ. of Camb., Vol. II, p. 528.) But it was not only the common law as a principle that Ruggle wished to bring into disrepute, it was also first of all the debased, almost unintelligible language; then, in the next place, the character and false methods of the common lawyers as a class that he wished to satirise. (See Ward, Eng. Dram. Lit., edit. 1875, Vol. II, p. 368.) A fair picture of the type of lawyer which Ruggle intended to satirise in the character of Ignoramus, as well as a good example of the wit in the satire is reflected in the conversation between the wily Trico and Musaeus, the university student and discontented clerk of Ignoramus, Act II., sc. 6.

Musaeus. Trico, narrabo tibi Aenigma; tu conjice.

Trico. Narra.

Musaeus. Quid illud est, quod jure vixit et injuria;

Quod magni-pusillanimum; quod ambidexter et bifrons;

Quod multa dicit et nihil; quod jocosa serio, seria joco;

Quod Anglice, Saxonice, Gallice et Latine loquitur,

Neque tamen Anglice, neque Saxonice, neque Gallice, neque Latine loquitur;

Quod leges scripsit, ne sient captiones; quod captiones

Scriptitat, ne sient leges; quod finitum facit

Infinitum; verum non verum, non verum verum facit.

Trico. Quod verum non verum facit? est ille Belzebug Sydonius.

Musaeus. Est, et non est.

Trico. Quod lingua ignota loqui amat, est homo Pontificius.

Musaeus. Simile quid, non illud tamen.

Trico. O lapidem me! jam habeo.

Musaeus. Quid jam?

Trico. Herus tuus Ignoramus est.

Musaeus. Oedipus es.

Trico. Huic Monstro quis genitor?

Musaeus. Pater Francus Soloicophanes, mater Barbara Latina.

Trico. Ubi gentium natus?

Musaeus. In magna Puritania.

Trico. Qua Urbe?

Musaeus. Sive *Aurelia*, sive *Argentina*.

Trico. Quo cibo victitat?

Musaeus. Communi Jure.

Trico. Non doctus? Septem scit liberales artes.

Musaeus. Septem? literas novit omnes.

Trico. Dii boni! omnes?

Musaeus. Si quidem

Viginti quatuor sunt omnes.

Trico. Homo perpaucorum hominum.

Musaeus. Certe pauci sunt istius modi: attamen

Quilibet ordo stultos et prudentes, bonos et malos habet;

Neque in bona segite nullum est spica nequam, neque in mala

Non aliquid bonum. Paucorum igitur gratia et totos ordines,

Et multorum studia incessere (quod non nemo facit) stultum

ego

Et inhumanum semper esse censui. Possem, si opus,

Infinitos celebrare ordinis hujus viros; ingenio,

Pietate, doctrina praestantes, adeo vix ut invenias pares;

Qui jus patrium (quo nil sanctius, nihil aequius)

Et explicarunt docte, et sincere dicunt: hos merito,

Ut aequum est, suspicimus: nam et a nobis et pro nobis sunt.
Scientiae,

Nisi Ignoramus, hostis nemo est. Ignoramus igitur illiusque
similes,

Qui ecclesiam et academias pessundatas cupiunt—

Trico. Valeant. *Musaeus.* Imo eant in Morboniam.

This passage just quoted may serve also to introduce the observation that our drama mirrors, less distinctly to be sure, also other phases of the social and political life of the day. Scorn is meted out copiously to two religious parties of the time, namely the Puritan and the Jesuit in the following manner.

Possibly Ruggle could have cast no greater slur upon Puritanism than to make Ignoramus a member of that party, yet that is what he does, when he, in the above passage, causes Musaeus to answer the question "Ubi gentium natus?" with the sentence "In magna Puritana." This sect is also certainly included in the illiusque similes, when Musaeus again says, "Ignoramus igitur illiusque similes, qui ecclesiam et Academias pessundatas cupiunt—imo eant in Morboniam." Moreover the character Theodorus, as he is portrayed in scenes I, 1; I, 8; and V, 5, 6, 7, is self-righteous, grasping, exacting and stern to cruelty, all of which is in striking contrast to the tenderness and compassionate love of Callifrone, the corresponding character in *La Trappolaria*, who, unlike Theodorus, only sends his son away from the city to save him, as he believes, from an evil associate. This figure in our drama is certainly typical of the austere Puritan character. It is important to note here, that Ruggle is said to have written a drama entitled "Re Vera" or "Verily" expressly to satirise the Puritans.¹

That the comedy Ignoramus was received by the Jesuits as an offence is clear from the account of the king's second visit, which we reprint in an appendix hereto. The satire against this faith is expressed in the drama in several ways. In both

¹ See Fleay's "Chronicle of the English Drama," under Ruggle, George; also Hawkins' edit. *Igno.*, p. lxxii.

the first and second prologues there is a character named Davus Dromo or Musarum Caballus. In the first prologue, in the form of a hobby-horse, he is the only object of ridicule. In the second prologue this same character is again brought upon the stage but this time in company with the famous Romanist and satirist of King James, Schioppius. In turn both are tried before and sentenced by their most hated enemy, the Puritan Ignoramus. Mr. Chamberlain, in an account of the king's first visit, which we reprint in an appendix hereto, states that "David Drummond in a hobby-horse, and Brockyn, the recorder of the town, under the name of Ignoramus, a common lawyer, bare great parts"; and Mr. Hawkins identifies this character with David Droman, one of the king's fools (edit. Ignoramus, p. 11, n. a.). But that this person was a Romanist and that Ruggle intended to ridicule him and his language as such will be apparent from the following passages. In the first prologue Dromo or Caballus says, "Quidni ego, qui omnes linguas calleam, ελληνικήν, Latinam, Française, Castellania, Italiana, Teuch, Polaski." Equiso says of him "Caballus etiam ecclesiasticus olim, Decanus scilicet de Dunstable." Again Caballus says of himself, "Ignoramus enim causicus et ego assines sumus"; and Equiso answers: "Scite; ambo enim barbare loquimini." Also in the second prologue Dulman says of Dromo "nam olim voluit esse Decanus de Dunstable," and Ignoramus puts this question to him, "Sed, sirrah, num id verum est, quod tu scribebas in Latino ad Papam facere te cardinalem?" From these passages it appears that this character, Dromo, was no mere clown, as Hawkins asserts but one who knew a variety of languages and who had at least striven for ecclesiastical honors. Characters of this name appear in Kirchmayer's "Pammachius" and Foxe's "Christus Triumphans," both of which were anti-catholic plays and in both of which Dromo is an emissary of the devil.

In the drama proper this purpose to ridicule Jesuits appears in various speeches, most prominently in scene II, 3, where nearly the entire scene is occupied with jesting about Jesuit books and Jesuit characters. But the purpose of our author

to bring into ridicule the Jesuit was most effectively accomplished by introducing the character, Cala, the monk, as the accomplice of the wily Trico, and boon companion of the glutton, Cupes, and partaker with the latter in his revels and evil associations. Also his conversations with Cupes and Polla's unseemly confession stamps him as a character most carnal. There seems to be a purpose on the part of our author to let these two troublesome subjects of the king punish one another. The exorcism of Ignoramus the Puritan is executed by the monk, his most hated enemy; even as in the second prologue Ignoramus examined and sentenced the Jesuits.

Of the variety of motives that enter into the composition of our comedy Mullinger says, "We have now to note how, in the characters and plot of Ignoramus, this sympathy was skillfully turned to account by the author; and how, apart from the genuine merits of the play, the manner in which it at once appealed to the royal predilections, to professional jealousies, to political rivalries, and to local animosities, might have sufficed to secure for a production of far less merit a certain measure of success."

IV. FORM AND LANGUAGE.

The comedy *Ignoramus* consists of fifty-three scenes, two prologues and an epilogue grouped in five acts. Scenes I, 1, 2 and II, 1; also the first parts of scenes I, 4; and V, 1, are written in Plautine iambs. The remaining scenes of the drama are written in sprightly prose, with the exception of a few Skeltonian verses inserted here and there, principally in scenes I, 5; III, 10; and IV, 6.

Aside from the abundant wit and laughable situations in *Ignoramus*, a judicious use of several devices of language; namely the pedantic and Macaronic; add greatly to the comic effect and doubtless did a great deal toward giving the comedy its immediate success and its enduring popularity.

PEDANTIC LANGUAGE.

Examples of the common mingling of two or more languages are found in all European literatures from an early date; as, for example, the German poem from the middle of the tenth century in reference to the reconciliation of Otto I. with his brother, written half in Latin, half in old High German. The name applied to this kind of mingled language in Italy was "pedantesca" or sometimes after the middle of the sixteenth century "fidencian" from a poem in this style by Camillo Scrofa entitled, "Cantici di Fidenzio Glottocrilio Ludimagistro." In England where the Anglo-Saxon and the Norman lived side by side, amongst whom lived also the wandering scholar and the clerical, who used principally Latin, such mingling of languages had an early and natural development. As ten Brink says, "a Babylonian confusion of tongues saluted the honest English burger." An interesting example of such commingling is a lyric from the end of the thirteenth century composed in Latin and French with only the last two verses in English:

Dum ludis floribus velut lacinia
 Se dieu d'amour moi tient en tiel *angustia*,
 Morir m'estuet de duel e de *Miseria*,
 Si je ne l'ay *quam amo super omnia*.

Ejus amor tantum me facit fervere,
 Que je ne soi *quid possum inde facere*;
 Pur ly covent *hoc saeculum relinquere*,
 Si je ne pus l'amour de li *perquirere*.

Ele est si bele e gente dame *egregia*,
 Cum ele fust *imperatoris filia*
 De beal semblant *et pulchra continencia*,
 Ele est la flur *in omni regis curia*.

Quant je la vey, je su *in tali gloria*,
 Come est la lune *coeli inter sidera*,
 Dieu la moi doint *sua misericordia*.
 Beyser e fere *quae secuntur alia*!

Scripti haec carmina in tabulis.
 Mon ostel est en mi la vile de Paris;
May y sugge namore, so wel me is;
Yef y deye for love of hire, duel hit ys.

In similar manner Ignoramus and Dulman, at times also other characters of our drama commingle with their Latin, English, French, Portuguese. But one of the most prominent marks of pedanticism in the comedy is the manner in which Ignoramus and Dulman insert in pedantic manner into their every-day conversation a multitude of Latin law terms and phrases; which were so unintelligible to the laity, that his own clerk Musaeus of the university was compelled to say, "Equidem ego parum intellexi," and that the ignorant Polla believed the lawyer to be mad. A device similar to this, and one which probably suggested it to the author of Ignoramus, had been used in an earlier drama of the pedantic type, enacted at Cambridge, entitled "Pedantius." In this drama the humanist-professor, Pedantius, and the scholastic philosopher, Dromodotus, inserted into the midst of their speech, even as Ignoramus, for pedantic effect, not legal terms, but grammatic and philosophic phrases equally unintelligible to the ordinary hearer.

CONTENTS: LIBRARY BOOKS ONLY

Mailed at reduced rates
authorized by Post Office
Department, Ottawa. CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT

No Postage Stamp Necessary if Mailed in Canada

POSTAGE PAID BY

The Librarian,

University of Toronto Library,



MACARONIC LANGUAGE.

The term macaronic is often applied erroneously to any kind of mixed language such as that of which we have just spoken; but true macaronic literature requires that the basis of the composition be Latin, intermingled with foreign words, generally from the vernacular of the writer, inflected, construed and arranged according to the rules of the Latin language. In distinction from pedantic, which makes a vulgar use of Latin, generally for the sake of pedantic or satirizing effect, macaronic language, on the other hand, solely for the sake of comic effect, latinizes words from another language. This style of literature had its origin in Italy, probably in the fifteenth century, and possibly received its name from the Italian macaroni, the favorite dish of the peasant people. A certain Tifo Odasi of Padua, who died in 1488, is generally given the credit of being the originator of this style. He composed a satire against his fellow-citizens, which however was uncompleted, when he died, entitled, "*Carmen Macaronicum de Padavinis quibusdam Arte Magica defusis.*" Among his imitators the most distinguished was Theophilo Folengo, 1491–1544, who published a volume of poems, which he entitled "*Phantaseae Macaronicae.*" It is in twenty-five parts and is a mixture of Latin, Tuscan and plebeian words. In France the first known writer of macaronic verses was Antonius de Avena, who addressed a macaronic poem to his fellow-students as early, it is said, as 1519. One of the best of his works is a long burlesque account of the disastrous expedition of Charles the Fifth in Provence. Rabelais' "*Gargantua*" particularly the nineteenth chapter of the first book is one of the most important examples of the macaronic form, produced in France. The oldest German macaronic poem is the "*Floia*," which first appeared in 1593. The principal interest of this history to us, is to ask when this style of writing was introduced into English literature. The honor, if honor it may be called, has been assigned by some authorities to John Skelton, 1460–1529;¹ by others to the Scotch poet William Drummond of Hawthornden, who lived and wrote in the

¹ See Meyers, *Kon. Lexicon*, under *Macaronische Poesie*.

first half of the seventeenth century, but whose famous macaronic poem, "Polemo-Middinia," was not published until 1691.¹ This work therefore appeared sixty years after the publication of Ignoramus.

The claim of Skelton to the use of the true macaronic style is unwarranted. Contrary to the requirements of macaronic writing, the basis of Skelton's poems is English, not Latin. He commingles with the English only sparsely Latin and French. He often repeats rhymes by means of an arbitrary addition of new syllables, but they are new formations simply and solely for the purpose of rhyme, and do not conform to Latin inflections and Latin constructions, as the true macaronic always does. Skelton is a pedantic writer with the addition of his new rhyming tricks.

It is to Ruggle, to whom the distinction is due, of first introducing the macaronic influence into England; an influence which may have had a connection with the formation of the famous Macaroni Clubs of London in the third quarter of the eighteenth century. To Ruggle is due also the distinction of being, in all probability, the first of all European writers to introduce the macaronic style into comedy. This distinction has been accredited to Molière, in his "Malade Imaginaire,"² which appeared, however, fifty years later than Ignoramus. The first utterance of Ignoramus as he first steps upon the stage, sc. I, 3, is "Phi, Phi tanta pressa, tantum crowdum." Ignoramus and Dulman mingle such expressions with their Latin throughout the drama but the height of ludicrousness is attained when Ignoramus recites to Rosabella, sc. I, 5, his *versus Legales*. They are as follows:

"Si possem, vellem pro te, Rosa, ponere pellem
Quicquid tu vis, crava, et habebis singula brava:
Et dabo Fee simple, si monstras Love's pretty dimple,
Gawnos, silkcoatos, kertellos, et petticoatos,
Farthingales biggos, stomacheros, et periwiggos,
Pantofflos, cuffos, garteros, spanica ruffos,
Buckos et soccos, tiffanos et Cambrica Smockos,
Pimpillos, pursos: ad ludos ibis et ursos."

¹ See Allebone's *Dict. of Authors*, under Wm. Drummond.

² See Schade, *Zur Makkaronischen Poesie* (im *Weimarischen Jahrbuch*, Bd. II., S. 409 ff.).

V. IGNORAMUS: COMPARISON WITH LA TRAPPOLARIA, AND OTHER SOURCES.

In order to establish the degree of our author's originality, a comparison of his drama with its sources will now be necessary.

A manuscript, No. 980, of the Harleian collection, page 161, contains a memorandum in the following words,¹ "The comedy of Ignoramus, so abusive against lawyers, and supposed to be made by Mr. Ruggell, of Clare Hall, in Cambridge, is but a translation of a comedy by Baptist Porta, out of Italian, intituled Trapulario, as may be seen by the comedy itself, extant in Clare Hall library, with notes of Mr. Ruggell's thereon of his contriving and altering thereof."

Mr. J. S. Hawkins, who examined this copy of Trappolaria in Clare Hall, establishes the inaccuracy of this statement, by asserting that the notes in this copy are only eleven in number, and that they have nothing to do with the altering of the work.² He also points out that the author of this memorandum, in all probability based his statement principally upon the following note written on the leaf preceding the title page of this same copy of La Trappolaria "Comedia multo piena di Trappolaria, da chi fù tradotta la comedia, intitolata Ignoramo, composta dal ingeniosimo huomini [ingeniosissimo huomo] maestro Georgio Ruggle, socio del collegio di Clar," etc., signed J. J.

La Trappolaria did indeed furnish the author of Ignoramus the main features of plot, but to name Ruggle's drama a translation, would be to rob its author of that ingenuity, which the writer of the note just quoted attributes to him and which he deserves.

La Trappolaria was composed by the celebrated Italian scientist and writer Giam-Battista della Porta, who was at the beginning of the seventeenth century the foremost writer of

¹ Harl. MS. 980 is not a MS. of Ignoramus, but a common place book (of Thomas Gibbons?).

² Edit. Igno., p. xviii, n. a.

Roman-Italian comedies in the Plautine-Ariosto style. This comedy combines various elements borrowed from different comedies of Plautus, principally the *Pseudolus*, the *Menaechmi* and the *Epidicus*. It was first published at Bergamo in Lombardy, 1596, and was reprinted at Venice the following year, 1597. Of sources other than *La Trappolaria* to which the author of *Ignoramus* was indebted the most important are (1) "*Pedantius*," a Latin drama enacted at Cambridge, probably as early as 1581. (See Smith, edit. *Ped.*, p. x; also Churchill and Keller's *Universitätsdramen*, *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, Bd. XXXIV, p. 256.) (2) Cervantes' mock heroic romance, *Don Quixote*, of which the first edition appeared, in 1605, at Madrid; and of which a translation into English appeared at London, 1613; the very time at which Ruggle was in all probability beginning the composition of his comedy. (See above, p. 10, note.) (3) *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus* and *The Return from Parnassus*, in two parts. (See above, p. 13.)

Several dramas of Shakespeare, to which we refer under comparison, contributed also in all probability to Ruggles stock of wit and types; but a direct influence is not easy to establish.

FIRST PROLOGUE.

The first prologue presents to us three characters: first, a hobby-horse named *Caballus Musarum* or *Davus Dromo*; and, secondly, *Cursor* and *Equiso*, who are commissioned by the Muses to seek for this Caballian horse, which had made his escape and was not to be found. When at last *Caballus* is captured and subdued, he at once insists upon leading the prologue, for which ambitious claim he is sharply ridiculed by *Cursor* and *Equiso*.

Whoever this *Davus Dromo* was or whatever class of men he represented, the purpose of the entire prologue is to thoroughly burlesque him. It is said of him, "*Homo fuit: sed cum homo non magis saperit quam caballus, iratae Musae, quas vexabat indies, mutarunt eum in Caballinum hominem.*" Notwithstanding this he knew many languages, and appears once to have sought ecclesiastical preferment. He is treated with

utmost contempt. Cursor tells him, "Imo transcendes ab equo ad asinum." Finally as the last degree of disgrace he is told, "Hinc te jam ducam igitur, quo dignus es, ad Ignorandum, is te semper posthac, inequitabat."

As we have shown in a previous chapter, this character Dromo had once sought at Rome ecclesiastical preferment. He therefore in several respects seems to have a correspondence with Philomusus and Studioso of the "Return from Parnassus," who had also gone to Rome on like errand, and who being disappointed in this hope returned in great want to their native land and there among other occupations contemplated becoming actors.¹

The following passages of this scene suggest influence from "Parnassus."

Ret. fr. Par., Act III, Sc. 1, l. 1159. "If any man or woman, can tell any tydings of a horse with fowre feete, two eares, that did straye about the seventh howre, three minutes in the forenoone the fift day.

Ignoramus.

Equiso. Bene mones: Oyez—Oyez—Oyez: "Musarum Caballus aberravit modo, nomine Davus Dromo, qui semi homo et totus caballus est, biceps bestia, vegrandi capite et recalvastro, perlongis auribus, etc."

Return from Parnassus, Part I, Act III, Sc. I, l. 1155. "It is my custome in my common talke to make use of my readings in the Greeke, Latin, French, Italian, Spanishe poetts, and to adorn my oratorye with some prettie choice extraordinarie sayings."

Ignoramus.

Cabal. Quidni ego, qui omnes linguas calleam 'Ελληνικην, Latinam, Françoise, Castellana, Italiana, Teuch, Polaski.

A Dromo appears also as a character in the Pilgrimage to Parnassus, but in another rôle from Davus Dromo in Ignoramus.

The picture of the horse in this prologue shows signs of influence also from Don Quixote: "he went to view his horse, whose bones stuck out like the corners of a Spanish real, being a worse jade than Gonela's, qui tantum pellis et ossa fuit" (Chap. I). "Rozinante was most wonderfully deliniated, so long and lank, so lean and feeble, with so sharp a back-bone" (Chap. IX). Cf. description of horse in Ignoramus. "Davus Dromo, qui semi-homo et totus Caballus est,

¹ Compare Macray's edit. "Parnassus," preface, p. viii; "Return from Parnassus," Part II, Prologue; also Sc. I, 4; also Sc. IV, 3, l. 1824 ff. Comp. also Ward's Eng. Dram. Lit.

biceps bestia, vegrande capite, et recalvastro, perlongis auribus, rubicundo rostro quasi ore patulo, labris prominentibus, juba curta et subruffa, excoviato dorso, pedibus anterioribus ulcerosus, colore vario, cum rotunda macula in clune nigricante." Don Quixote's horse, like that in the prologue under consideration, is a racer and is also compared with other horses of fame: "it seemed as if wings at that instant had sprung on Rozinante, so lightly and swiftly he moved" (Chap. XIV); "neither Astolpho's Hippogriff, nor the famous Frontino, which cost Bradamante so dear, could match thee in speed" (Chap. XX). Cf. Ignoramus, "Quin cursu provoco omnes Nobilium hic praesentium equos celeripedes, sive Puppy, sive Franklin, sive Peppercorne, sive Crop-eare, sive Snow-ball, sive Saucie Jack, Frecke, Spanyard, Peg with a Lanterne, Strawberries and Cream," etc. With these fanciful names we may compare again another passage from Don Quixote which treats of the magic horse: "'His name,' answered the Trifaldi, 'is not the same as the horse of Bellerophon, which was called Pegasus; nor is he called Bucephalus, like that of Alexander the Great; nor Brilladore, like that of Orlando Furioso; nor is it Bayarte, which belonged to Reynaldos of Montalvan; nor Frontina, which was the steed of Rogero; nor is it Boëtes, nor Pyrvis—names given, it is said to horses of the sun, etc.'" (Chap. LXXIII). Moreover, the passage in Ignoramus immediately following the one quoted above mentions also a magic horse: "neque etiam quemvis equum vel fatidicum, vel magicum recuso.

SECOND PROLOGUE.

The interest of the second prologue consists in its being a trial scene, wherein two characters are brought upon the stage one after the other and tried before Ignoramus and his clerk Dulman. The first to be examined and sentenced is the same Davus Dromo, alias Messe Davy, who was ridiculed by the use of the hobby-horse in the first prologue. The second person to appear before the mock-tribunal was a character representing the famous German scholar, and champion of the Pope, Gaspar Schioppius, who had not only written against Protestants in all Europe, but had also for various reasons satirized King James without mercy.

This trial of these two representatives of the Catholic church suggests influence from W. Turner's "Examination of the Mass," a work written, and in all probability performed at Cambridge, about the middle of the sixteenth century. In this

play a character representing the mass is brought before a formal court, where she is accused, proven guilty and condemned to banishment.

CORRESPONDING DRAMATIS PERSONAE OF LA TRAPPOLARIA AND IGNORAMUS.

La Trappolaria.

1. *Callifrone*.....old gentleman.
2. *Arsenia*.....his son.
3. *Filesia*.....young lady.
4. *Trappola*.....servant of Cal.
5. *Lucrino*.....a bawd.
6. *Fagone*.....a parasite.
7. *Gabrina*.....his wife.
8. *Poleone*.....a tailor.
9. *Cuoco*.....a cook.
10. *Heleonora*.....wife of Cal.
11. *Dragoleone*.....a sea captain.
12. *Deutifrangolo*.....his servant.
13. *Leonetto*.....another servant.

Ignoramus.

1. *Theodorus*....an old gentleman.
2. *Antonius*.....his son.
3. *Rosabella*.....young lady.
4. *Trico*.....servant of Theo.
5. *Tocol*.....a bawd.
6. *Cupes*.....a book peddler.
7. *Polla*.....his wife.
8. *Pyropus*.....a tailor.
9. *Caupo*.....an inn keeper.
10. *Dorothea*.....wife of Theo.
11. *Ignoramus*.....a lawyer.
12. *Dulman*, }
13. *Pecus*, }his clerks.

SILENT CHARACTERS.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 14. <i>Don Giovanni</i> ,
former husband of Hel. | 14. <i>Maulius</i> ,
former husband of Dor. |
| 15. <i>Efragia</i> , } | 15. <i>Catharina</i> , } |
| 16. <i>Elvira</i> , }his daughters. | 16. <i>Isabella</i> , }his daughters. |
| 17. <i>Lelio</i>son of Cal. and Hel. | 17. <i>Antoninus</i> .son of Theo. and Dor. |

NEW CHARACTERS IN IGNORAMUS.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. <i>Musaeus</i>clerk of Igno. | 4. <i>Cala</i>a monk. |
| 2. <i>Bannacar</i> , } | 5. <i>Surda</i>nurse to Rosabella. |
| 3. <i>Richardus</i> , } .servants of Theo. | 6. <i>Vince</i>page to Dorothea. |
| | 7. <i>Nell</i>attendant to Dorothea. |

CONTENTS AND COMPARISON OF DRAMA PROPER.

Act I, sc. 1, Theodorus relates to his son, Antonius, the history of his past life, and then demands of him, that he proceed at once to go from Bordeaux (the scene of the drama) to London, in order to visit and then bring hither his mother, brother and step-sister, whom neither husband nor son had seen for more than fifteen years.

LA TRAPPOLARIA.

Sc. I, 1.

Cal. Se mai l'ubidienza fece un figlio al suo padre ben caro, e amorevole, hor' Arsenio figlivol mio, l'importanza, e la necessità del fatto ti porgono assai largo campo di mostrar l'offerunza, e l'amor, che tu mi porti: poiche l'empito dell' una e dell'altra mi sforza a valermi della tua ubidienza.

Ars. Callifrone mio caro padre, se in tutto il corso della mia vita havete ricevuto da me tutti quelli uffici di servitù, e di ubidienza, che da figlio amorevol si possono desiderare, ne apersi le labro mai in contraddir al vostro imperio, perchè hora diffidandovi di comandarmi usate con me sì lungo prologo?

Cal. Ascolta prima l'importanza del negotio e poi quello che da te ricerco, penso, che harai più volte inteso da me, come per molte sicurtà, che feci qui in Napoli a diversi miei amici, fui forzato partirmene e andar in Barcelona,

IGNORAMUS.

Sc. I, 1.

Theo. Ergone obsequeris, fili?

Ant. Pater es, quid vis jube.

Theo. Euge, filii Antoni!

Quin tu primum omnium, quid sit, quod te velim

Quantique negotium, paucis ausculta mihi.

Audisse te per nebulam credo antehac,

E Londino uti Mercator a me Burdigalae hic

Magnam mercatus est vim vini nobilis,

Grandi id pecunia, sed praesenti neutiquam:

Quippe scripsit nummos: scripsit, non solvet tamen.

Tu, filii, nil crede; hic nervus est sapientiae:

Intellegis?

Ant. Recte, pater: perge, si placet.

Theo. Ego, ut is Londinensis fefellisset fidem,

Hinc eo Londinum recta, uti argentum exigam.

Ibi dum id flagito, dum is lente nomen expedit,

Fio interea familiaris populari meae,

LA TRAPPOLARIA.

quivi presi stretta amista con una donna Napolitana, chiamata Helionora, d'incorrotta honestà, e di bontà incomparabile, la quale era vedova d'un Don Giovanni di Moncada, cavaliere Spagnuolo, che se l'havea tolta in Napoli per moglie, e se l'havea condotta seco in Barcelona dove erano i suoi poderi, e le sue entrate. Havea egli d'un altra moglie due bellissime figliuole, la prima era detta Donna Eufragia, la Seconda Donna Elvira. Venne costui a morte, e la lasciò herede di ventimilia ducati, accioche quando le figlie fussero di età l'havebbe maritate secondo il suo parere. Accadde, che per li molti miei travagli, e di corpo, e di animo, infermai in Barcelona, ella mi raccolse in sua casa, e mi governò con tanta carità, che conobbi certissimo haver ricevuto la sanità da Dio per mezo del sue orationi, e diligenze nel governo. Restandole così obligato, e innamorato delle sue maniere, la chiesi per moglie, ella gradì la richiesta, e così ci spasammo insieme, e nel primo anno la feci madre di duo maschi in un parto, l'uno de'quali sei tu, l'altro è Lelio. E volendo tornarmene in Napoli, che tutta via s'andavano rassettando le cose mie condussi te, ch'eri più robusto meco, e lasciai Lelio con lei, ch'era più delicato. Ma però cravate tanto simili, che ne io, ne ella vi potenamo distinguere.

IGNORAMUS.

Viduae cuidam, Burdigalensi feminae:
Huic nomen Dorothea est; ea tunc temporis
Londini habitabat: illam enim uxorem hic duxerat
Opulentus Senator Londinensis, idem Eques;
Nomen ei Mallius. Mallius? imo Manlius.
Is adeo post nuptias huic transtulerat eam
Londinum in patriam suam: ibi in morbum incidens
Illam haeredem instituit, atque ad plures abiit:
Ex ea nulli huic nati sunt liberi; caeterum
Ex alia uxore, quam prius habuit scilicet,
Duas suscepit forma eximia filias:
Natu major Catharina, Isabella minor cluit.
has ille moriens, cum dote una, Dorotheae
Commisit fidei (quamlibet novercae) ute eas
Nuptum daret, simulac maturaee essent viro:
Divitiarum unde illis sat superque: eas tamen
Formae indolisque dotes quanto superaverant!

Quid multa? hanc ego ut vidi, ut perii, ambio diu,
Diu posco, diu negat; tandem an-nuit;
Fiunt nuptiae; fit, anno vertente, grvida;
Uno partu gemellos enixa est mihi;
Horum alter ipse es, Antoni fili; alter est

LA TRAPPOLARIA.

IGNORAMUS.

Antoninus. Eratis autem gemini
 pueri
 Forma tam simili ut dimidiatos
 dicerent;
 Vos neque ego, neque mater, inter-
 noscerimus, adeo,
 Nisi Antonino hic dextra in mala
 naevulus,
 Unde alium ab alio, haud alias, in-
 ternovimus.
 Caeterum ego post aliquot annos in
 patriam
 Redieus, illinc te sexennem jam
 mecum aveho.
 At fratrem Antoninum, cum Doro-
 thea simul,
 Reliqui Londini, annis abhinc quin-
 decem.
 Namque uti per Franciam iter huc
 perreximus
 Anglis cum Francis bellum undique,
 Capti sumus
 Igitur ab hostibus; neque sex menses
 plus est,
 Quum, pace utrinque inita, esse nos
 liberos sinunt.
 Liber ut fui, cogitabam Londinum
 indies,
 Dorotheam meam ut reviserem. At
 pravis litibus
 Detentus hic ingratiis, usque dum
 haereo,
 Et usque, et esque. O Laernaeam
 vere sobolem
 Pragmaticorum, qui lites ex litibus
 serunt
 Mortalibus immortaliter! Lites
 fuge.
 Macrum arbitrium opimo iudicio
 potius est.
 Memento, fili.
Ant. Memini, Pater.
Theo. Ergo dum licet.
 Matrem nunc tuam videre gestio,
 fratremque, et novam
 Illius nuptam.
Ant. Eum duxisse Catharinam
 ferunt.

LA TRAPPOLARIA.

Quando eravamo in Barcelona, consentammo più volte insieme dar le due sorelle a voi duo fratelli, perche essendo bambini v'amavate con tanto ardore, ch'era una cosa mirabile, oltre che ne io, ne tua madre, ne tutto il mondo insieme, v'haurebbe potuto elegger mogli, come quelle, nobili, belle, ricche e honestissime. Donna Eufragia à già maritata con Lelio, e se tu fossi stato in Barcelona, forse non sarebbe stata rubbata e faresti marito di Donna Elvira.

IGNORAMUS.

Theo. Scilicet. Namque ego et uxor decrevimus jamdiu,
 Duas illas ex priori uxore filias,
 Quas dixi Manlii, vobis innuptias dare.
 Vos illis itaque despondimus a parvulis,
 Antonino utique Catharinam, Isabellam tibi.

Sed misera Isabella destinata tibi periit.

Nutriabatur illa Detfordiae, prope Thamesin;

Ibi una cum nutrice jam quadrimula, Seu subrepta, seu submersa, periit novemdecim.

Abhinc annis.

Ant. Catharinam quam memoras, pater, Vidistin'?

Theo. Nunquam, namque illam illius avia

Educabat, a nobis longe in Devonia: Tantum est, fili, Sci'n jam quid sit, quod te velim?

Ant. Nondum, pater;—sed si id est, quod, suspicor, perii.

Ars. V'ho inteso dir questo almeno cinquanta volte.

Cal. Hor havendo già districate le mie facultà da creditori, se ben più tardi assai, che non istimava, non son ito a torla io, ne ho mandalo altri per lei, sperando, hoggi mi parto io, domani mando per lei, son già passati quindici anni, hor la età mi da molta incommodità; e muanzi tempo mi dà i difetti del tempo; onde la promessa mi obliga, che mandi te in Bracelona a condurla in Napoli, che molto desidera repatriare, e son tanti

LA TRAPPOLARIA.

anni, che mi sollecita, che se non mando tosto a torla, se ne verrà sala con helio. Conosco haver tanto torto, che la memoria ancor se ne vergogna, e non voglio più trattenerla. Onde tutte queste cose insieme, e ciascuna per se, mi sforzano a comandarti, che subito, subito ti parti da Napoli per Barcelona a farle compagnia.

Ars. Padre, se ben le ragioni, che vi muovono a mandarmi sono importanti, tutta volta mi pare strana cosa, che essendo tardato quindici anni a non far così fatto viaggio, hor vogliate, ch'io vada così subito, e senza haverne fatto mai alcuno, volete c'hora ne facci un così lungo. Io non vò in conto alcuno lasciar d'ubidirvi, ma vi chiedo un poco di tempo a pensarvi e a prepararmi prima le cose necessarie.

IGNORAMUS.

Theo. Hoc scilicet; tu illico hinc Londinum uti naviges,
Matrem huc quo deducas, cum fratre et familia.

Ant. Occidi; amores mei peribunt interim.

Theo. En tibi,
Mater tua scripsit venturam se huc propediem,
Saltem Antoninum fratrem misuram illico.
Cogita, quam suave tibi erit, post tantum spatium,
Matrem tibi osculum, fratrem amplexus dare.
Quid est? quid frontem caperas?
quid oculi turbidi?

Ant. Numquid dolet?
Ant. Equidem, ut verum fatear, hoc est Amare.

Theo. Hui: amas?

Ant. Minime, pater, horreo, inquam, mare.

A-mare mihi nunc aegre est.

Theo. Eia, delicias facis,
Causas fingis, video; tibi eo abeundum est statim.

Ant. Statim, pater?

Theo. Statim fili. Obtemperas mihi?

Cal. Io ben sapevo, che saresti stato prontissimo al viaggio, ma

LA TRAPPOLARIA.

il lungo essardio, che hò teco fatto, è stato, accioche tu dovessi partir subito, l'amor e l'osservanza d'un buon figlio comanda, che mai non debba replicare al padre, ma rimettere il tutto in suo potere, perche sà più che egli non sà, ne da niuno è amato, come dal padre, perche il padre amò prima lui, ch'egli cominciasse ad amar se stesso, e che sempre vegghia, accioche riposi, e risparmi, accioche rimanga ricco. Si parte una nave per Barcelona di Triffon Damiano mio amico, più giorni sono, t'hò provveduto d'ogni commodità, onde non hai a far altro, che imbarcarti. Hor m'ha fatto intendere, che ha il vento in poppa, ha salpate l'ancore, è uscita dal porto, e ha spiegate le vele.

Ars. Non bisogna almeno una settimana per licenziarmi da parenti, e da gli amici?

Cal. Co'parenti, è con gli amici farò io l'ufficio da tua parte, gli esporrò la necessità, e la fretta della partita.

Ars. Non videte, che spira un Levante gagliardo, che è contrario al mio navigare?

Cal. Conosco le scuse, che non fai quello, che dici. Se Barcelona

IGNORAMUS.

Anat. Meum est, sed quaeso cogitandi spatium, pater.

Theo. Enimvero pulchre! pater ubi imperat, ibi.

Filium rogare cogitandi spatium: pudet.

Ant. Faciam vero libiter: at—

Theo. Quid at?

Ant. Peto

Suppliciter, mihi hos sex, aut septem dies impertias,

Tantum ut parem me, et amicis valediciam meis.

Theo. Ne te hoc sollicitet, faciam id ego vicem tuam.

At quae itineri opus, parata jam sunt omnia;

Navem conduxi, mercedem dedi, nihil desit.

Ant. Sin Anglia Septentrionem versus est,

Mare mihi praeclusum; fiat ita Auster jam oppositus Septentrioni.

Theo. At hoc est quod properes velim:

Namque Auster huic te recta in Angliam feret. Quid jam?

Ant. Audi'n ut pelago ventus irascitur? vide'n?

Uti procellas coelum minatur nubilum?

Theo. Sanusne? an somnias vigilans lenis en enim

LA TRAPPOLARIA.

stà in Ponente, vi bisogna Levante
per andarvi: anzi questo Levante
fretta.

Ars. Datemi almeno quattro giorni
di tempo, e se non vagliono le
mie ragione appresso voi, almeno
ci vagliano i prieghi.

Cal. Io sono stato quello che hò
pregato prima te, e fa conta se
non vagliono teco i miei prieghi,
che ne i tuoi valeranno meco. Io
cerco il guisto, e però voglio, che
vogli ubidirmi. Il figlio, che
vuole essere il vero herede del
padre, bisogna essergli ubidente,
e io mi vergognarei d'esser padre
di un figlio, che non volesse ubid-
ermi. Tu non hai quì uffici, ne
moglie ne figlivoli, che non sia
sempre apparecchiato à partire,
mi dai à credere, che sei qui
trattenuto da qualche vano, e dis-
honesto pensiero. Vergognati
dunque di far quello che ripren-
deresti in un'altro.

Ars. Io vi giuro padre per quella
riverenza, che vi porto, che non
mento. Certi amici mi han dato
catene di oro, gioie, e danari a
servare, onde è forza, che mi
diate un poco di tempo, accioche
gli restituisca, altrimenti stime-
rebbono, che me ne fussi fuggito,
per rubbargliele.

Cal. Questo poco di tempo quante
hore sono?

IGNORAMUS.

Auster uti flat sudo et secundo
flamine.

Nescio quid sit; non temere est
quod nugas agis.

Jam abeundum est, jam jamque
enimvero Succenseo.

Ant. Jamne? Ahime Rosabella mea.
mea.

Theo. Eia, fles, puerule? Dii!
Quid hoc rei est?

Ant. Mirumne id, si ira benigni
patris.

Theo. Si id est, bene est.

Quid moramur igitur?

Ant. Unicum hoc oro, pater, dum
amico restituo.

Credita mihi deposita: tantillum
temporis modo concedas mihi.

Theo. Tantillum id quantillum est?

LA TRAPPOLARIA.

Ars. Tre, o quattro hore.

Cal. In tre, o quattro hore la nave
potrà giungere à Gaeta, e non ti
potrai più imbarcare.

Ars. Almeno due hore.

Cal. Così sa. Io andrò a scrivere
una lettera a tua madre, più me
andrò al molo a far trattene-
re un poco la nave. Tu non far che
t'abbia ad aspettar molto.

IGNORAMUS.

Ant. Horas quatuor, haud amplius.

Theo. Nimium est. Nautae jam te
expectant, vela ut explicent.

Ant. Binas saltem horulas.

Theo. Binas licet. Interim in-
troibo ego, ut obse-
nem ad Dorotheam literas.

Tibi argentum ut promam; at par-
cas tu sumptui:

Namque lites plurimum mihi inter-
cipiunt pecuniae.

Dandum est crumeni-mulgis istis
causidicis;

Usque est dandum atque usque.

Aurum, quam aequum, plus potest.

In Act I, sc. 2, Antonius appears on the stage, laments in a soliloquy his fate and relates the details of his love; Rosabella, of whom he is violently enamoured, is the daughter of a Portuguese nobleman, who, at his death, entrusted her to the care of his brother Rodrigo Torcol. The latter, having been reduced to poverty through misfortune, was now conducting at Bordeaux a common brothel. However, that he might sell Rosabella to better advantage, he had had respect to her rank and chastity. His price for her was 600 gulden, which sum, out of love for the girl, and an honorable desire to free her from a disreputable home, Antonius had promised to pay: but because he could not raise the money necessary within the allotted time, Torcol believed himself to have been deceived by Antonius, and therefore turned to Ignoramus, a London lawyer, who at that time was tarrying at Bordeaux, and who readily promised to pay for the girl the sum desired.

Because of this situation Antonius fears to depart from Bordeaux at this time. While Antonius ridicules, in his monologue, the lawyer Ignoramus, the latter draws nigh. Antonius is again summoned by his father.

The first six verses of the scene just related are a condensation of the entire second scene of the Trappolaria. The information con-

cerning Torcol's life and character has its correspondent part, to some extent, in the fifth scene of Trappolaria. The ridicule of Ignoramus has no counterpart in the Italian source; but was probably influenced by Pedantius, whom we propose as a prototype of Ignoramus in the next scene.

Act I, sc. 3, brings before us Ignoramus in company with his three clerks, Dulman, Pecus and Musaeus, with whom he engages in ridiculous conversation. Dulman and Pecus, ignorant fellows, dance to the piping of their master, and use in their speech his jargon, a miserable mixture of Latin, French, English and Latin law-phrases. Musaeus, on the other hand, had been a member of the university, and as is fitting a scholar, always speaks good Latin. His self-respect does not permit him to flatter his master, as the other clerks do, but he tells him plainly that he is unable to understand the meaning of his remarks. He is therefore the object of sharp ridicule from Ignoramus and the other clerks. When, at the end of the scene, the lawyer is left alone, in a monologue, he reveals to us, that the cause of his nervous almost distracted state of mind, displayed at the beginning of the scene was and is here again his passion for Rosabella; he says of himself, "*Sum sicut musca sine caput, buzzo et turno circumcirca et nescio quod facio.*"

This scene has none corresponding to it in La Trappolaria. Not only the mixed language of this scene, but also the questions of the lawyer Ignoramus and the answers of his clerks betray the fact that Ignoramus is to play the historic rôle of the "Pedant," and not the ordinary pedant, but "The Pedant in Love." (For history of this character see Creizenach's "*Geschichte des neueren Dramas*," Bd. II, s. 280.) Several circumstances suggest the source of this influence. First, there was performed at Cambridge about 1581 the Latin drama entitled *Pedantius*, a satire directed against a Cambridge professor. This drama was differentiated from all earlier plays of the same genus, by the fact that the pedant in it was not the ordinary unworldly professor, but also a courtier, a man of the world. Ignoramus follows this innovation, he is a lawyer, a man-of-affairs. Secondly, *Pedantius*, the humanist professor, and his friend, a scholastic philosopher named *Dromodotus*, insert constantly into the midst of their conversations classical quotations and philosophical phrases. In the same pedantic manner Ignoramus and Dulman use here and

throughout the drama, in place of philosophical phrases, numerous and lengthy Latin law-phrases. The sources from which Ruggle derived these terms are said to be, first, a law work entitled "Symboleography, which may be termed the art or Description of Instruments and Presidents, collected by William West, of the Inner Temple Esquire. 4to 1590." Second, a work entitled "The Interpreter, or Book containing the signification of words; wherein is set forth the true Meaning of all, or the most part of, such Words and Terms as are mentioned in the Law Writers or Statutes of this Victorious and Renowned Kingdom, requiring any exposition or Interpretation: A Work not only profitable but necessary for such as desire thoroughly to be instructed in the Knowledge of the Laws, Statutes or other Antiquities. Collected by John Cowel, Doctor, and the King's Majesty's Professor of the Civil Law in the University of Cambridge. In legum obscuritate captio. At Cambridge, printed by John Legate Anno 1607."

The following speeches show evidence of influence also from the Parnassus dramas.

Pilgrimage to Parnassus, Act I, l. 130. The firste lande that we must travell in is Logique.

Ignoramus, Sc. I, 3.—IGNO. Quae Villa? quod Burgum est Logica? Mus. Est una artium liberalium.

Pilgrimage to Parnassus, l. 346. Studie not these vaine arts of Rhetorique, Poetrie and Philosophie; there is no sound edifying knowledge in them.

Ignoramus, Sc. I, 3.—IGNO. liberalium: sic putabam: In nomine dei stude artes parcas et lucrosas: non est mundus pro artibus liberalibus jam. Mus. Deditus etiam fui amori Philosophiae.

In scene 4 Torcol, the pimp, appears upon the stage, and begins in a monologue to explain how through ship-wreck he had lost the greater part of his fortune, and how, with what remained, he had brought together, for his dishonorable business, girls from all quarters of the world, who could speak all languages. As soon as Torcol observes Ignoramus, he greets him with great servility, and presently summons forth his maidens, each dressed in the costume of her native land, and bids them make music and dance for the entertainment of his distinguished victim. After a brief dispute, it is formally agreed and a contract signed to the effect, that Ignoramus shall have Rosabella in consideration of six hundred gulden, which

he promises to bring presently. If, however, he should send one of his clerks, the same should indicate that he was the proper messenger by pulling Torcol's nose.

This scene has no corresponding one in *La Trappolaria*. The entertainment which Torcol gives Ignoramus has its analogy in the second scene of the *Pseudolus* of Plautus (the principal source for *La Trappolaria*) where Ballio for the dilectation of Calidorus and *Pseudolus* exercises with a lash his servants. The negotiations for the protégée of the bawd are also according to the plan of *Pseudolus*, Sc. 3. *La Trappolaria* simply states that such negotiations had been made.

But before Ignoramus leaves the stage Torcol, Act. I, sc. 5, summons Rosabella. As she appears and sees Ignoramus, her appointed husband, she bursts into tears. Torcol scolds and threatens her, then places her under the surveillance of a deaf-mute, named Surda. As Torcol retires, Ignoramus approaches Rosabella and endeavors to console her, and charm her with a poem which he entitles "*Versus Legales de Rosabella*" (see above p. 22).

Rosabella, as if she were astounded by such eloquence, feigns submission. Ignoramus then hastens away to make arrangements for the marriage; which, however, we learn from a side remark, he intends to be only a sham; for he says when he returns to England he will then marry a rich wife and keep Rosabella as his mistress.

This scene is also new. The pedantic love-suit of Ignoramus suggests again influence from *Pedantius*. In tone the scene suggests the courtship of Petruchio and Katharina in Shakespear's "*Taming of the Shrew*." There is, however, no verbal correspondence. The language is original.

In Act I, sc. 6, Rosabella and Surda remain. Antonius and Trico come upon the stage. The latter approaches Surda and through the language of signs, soon makes her believe that he is in love with her. He even gives her a ring as token of his purpose to marry her. The poor woman is thus wonderfully flattered, and her attention wholly absorbed. In the meanwhile Antonius, on another part of the stage, according to the pre-

vious advice of Trico (so as not to awaken the suspicion and interference of Surda), is making, as it were angry gestures toward Rosabella and at the same time trying to console her grief, who in turn tells him of the signed contract for her delivery to Ignoramus.

The incidents of this scene just narrated find their counterpart to some extent in the third and fourth scenes of *La Trappolaria*. The plan is, however, changed by the introduction of the new character Surda. In the third scene of *La Trappolaria* Arsenio and Felesia are alone and in the fourth scene Trappola joins them. In the above scene of Ignoramus Antonius and Rosabella, Trico and Surda, on different parts of the stage engage at once in simultaneous dialogues. While in *La Trappolaria* the conversation between Arsenio and Felesia is long; that between Antonius and Rosabella, in Ignoramus, is very much condensed from, and has slight verbal correspondence with, the Italian. The plan to deceive Surda and the entire conversation in signs between Trico and Surda has naturally no correspondent part in *La Trappolaria*. The situation reminds of *Romeo and Juliet*, Sc. II, 2, where the lovers converse and the nurse is ignorant of what is transpiring.

Act I, sc. 7, brings Torcol again upon the scene, who disturbs the lovers' happiness. Surda is whipped. She appeals earnestly to her imagined lover for protection. Trico and Antonius quarrel with, and threaten Torcol. Rosabella and Surda are finally led away; and Torcol also retires.

The idea of this as a quarrel scene is borrowed from the fifth scene of the Italian drama. The following speeches have verbal or thought correspondence:

Arsenio. Et hai tanto ordir furf antissimo, batterla in mia presenza.

Lucrino. Chi sei tu? Che hai a far con me? O con lei? che io teco? Mi vuoi tu vietar, che non batta le schiaue mie?

Trappola. Et te lo dico, e ridico, acciò che ti guardi da me

Trappola. . . . ti dico che t'ingannerò,

Antonius. Ausus in conspectu meo hanc?

Torcol. Signor, abi quaeso; res tuas age, ego meas Nihil ego tecum.

Trico. Furcifer.

Torcol. . . . Cavebo dehinc de tricis tuis, Trico.

While Antonius and Trico tarry, in scene 8, Theodorus, in company with his faithful servant Bannacar, comes upon the

stage, and gives directions preparatory to the departure of Antonius. The latter in submission to his father's will, yet in great anguish of spirit, sails for England. He says, "Fiet, Vale Pater," then aside "ad mortem ego, nisi Trico—."

The conversation between Theodorus and Trico at the beginning of this scene, bears similarity to the lively conversation between Callifrone and Trappola in the sixth scene of *La Trappolaria*, yet the entire scene has been in our drama greatly condensed, and not more than six short speeches have any verbal likeness to the original.

In Act II, sc. 1, Theodorus rejoices, that his son is safely at sea, and that everything has been accomplished according to his wish. He then turns to his old servant Bannacar and piously reminds him what a debt of gratitude he owes his master, who had been the means of converting him from Mohamedanism to the Christian religion, then in the spirit of a hard task-master says to him: "i nunc intro igitur, tibi mandata ut geras"; then aside he adds, "usque exerceat opere."

The rather lengthy monologue of the old Callifrone in *La Trappolaria*, Act II, Sc. 2, is by our author condensed to the first four verses of the scene just narrated. The exchange of remarks between Theodorus and Bannacar has no counterpart in the Italian drama.

The idea of conversion from Mohamedenism to Christianity, which appears in this scene and also in scene V, 6, is rather a prominent incident of *Don Quixote*. See in particular Chaps. XV and XXXI.

Trico had followed with a skiff the vessel, overtaken it, and brought back to land his master Antonius, who, though pleased, shows at once in Act II, sc. 2 anxiety as to how they may get possession of Rosabella. Trico promises that, through the assistance of Cupes, a book vender, and some money, he can accomplish this also. Antonius gives his benefactor ten gulden which his father had given him for the voyage.

The plan of procedure, which is set forth in detail by Trappola in Act II, Sc. 2, of the Italian drama, and which is there practically the same as the plan of the *Pseudolus* of Plautus, is here in this scene of our drama not fully divulged. Trico, the master of intrigue, only reveals his plan as the occasion demands. In this respect he resembles *Pseudolus* rather than Trappola. This scene in our drama is, therefore, abbreviated from five pages in the Italian piece to one. The similarity of expression is slight.

While Trico yet tarries, Cupes appears, in Act II, sc. 3, proclaiming his wares, "Libelli, belli, belli, novi libelli!" Trico greets him and makes many a jest concerning his books, mostly Jesuit ones. After this, in consideration of eight gulden, Cupes promises first of all to induce his amazon-like wife, Polla, to be sent to Ignoramus in place of Rosabella; and in the next place that he himself will represent the part of Torcol (so named because of his wry neck) and thus deceive the messenger of Ignoramus, when he should appear for Rosabella; or in case Ignoramus should come for her in person, frighten him away with a gelders horn. Trico and Antonius go away to a tailor, to secure costumes necessary for the deception.

The object to be attained in this scene is the same as that in *La Trappolaria*, Act II, Sc. 3. However, the two scenes have little verbal or thought correspondence. In each we have the comical dialogue between the parasite and the wily servant, yet while the first half of the scene in our work is occupied with jesting about books, in *La Trappolaria* there are lengthy remarks concerning eating and drinking; in Ignoramus there is no necessity of persuasion, as in *La Trappolaria*, to induce Cupes to represent Torcol, for in the preceding scene Trico says, "Cupes se mihi operam daturam promisit hodie." The talk in the latter part of our scene is rather concerning Polla, and whether she can be induced to represent Rosabella. The idea of passing in review the books referred to in this scene is probably borrowed from the condemnation and destruction of Don Quixote's library by the curate and barber (cf. Don Q., Chap. VI).

Act II, sc. 4, transfers us to the house of Cupes, where he calls his wife. Polla raises her voice and answers, "Polla, Polla? Quid vociferare adeo? numnam ebrius es?" The two quarrel, and in turn jest with each other about eating, drinking and marital happiness. Polla will hear nothing of playing the role of another man's wife, but finally, when Cupes gives her two gulden and promises her that he will bring no mistress into the house during her absence, she consents.

Both this scene just related, and Act II, Sc. 4, of *La Trappolaria*, present to us the picture of men persuading their wives to act, for the time being, the part of another man's wife. Both women yield when a share of the booty is offered them. Though similar in plan, there is almost no verbal similarity between the two scenes.

Scene 5 presents Trico and Antonius imposing upon Pyropus, the tailor (since they have no more money), a worthless ring, as a guarantee for the costumes which they have just received.

The events of this scene find their counterpart in *La Trappolaria*, Act II, Sc. 5. However, as usual, they are narrated in an altogether different style.

In Act II, sc. 6, Musaeus in a monologue complains of the treatment he receives at the hands of his master. He then meets Trico, to whom he propounds an enigma. After Trico guesses that it concerns Ignoramus, and after they both exchange most satirical remarks directed against the lawyer, Musaeus informs Trico that his master is about to go in person to claim Rosabella. Trico at once requests Musaeus to go hastily and bid Cupes and Antonius be ready to receive the lawyer, according to the prearranged plan.

This scene has no corresponding one in *La Trappolaria*. The tone reminds us again of the *Return from Parnassus*. The ridicule heaped upon the ignorant, pedantic, conscienceless lawyer Gullio (*Ret. f. Par.*, Part I, Acts III, IV and V) and upon the venal Sir Raderick and his compliant lawyer, Sir Recorder (*Ret. f. Par.*, Part I, Scs. III, 1, 2, 4, and IV, 1, 2), all of whom were bitter antagonists of the University, finds its counterpart in the ridicule loaded upon Ignoramus in this scene. The following speeches have possibly some verbal correspondence.

Ret. from Par., I, Sc. IV, 1, l. 1153. It is my custome in my common talke to make use of my readinge in the Greeke, Latin, French, Italian, Spanishe poetts, and to adorn by oratorye with some prettie, choice extraordinarie sayings.

Ignoramus, Sc. II, 6. Quod Anglice, Saxonice, Gallice et Latine loquitur, etc. Cf. also above, prologue I, p. 41.

Ret. from Par., II, Sc. IV, 2, l. 1712. I pray you Monsieur Ploidon, of what University was the first lawyer of; none forsooth, for your Lawe is ruled by reason and not by arte, etc.

Ignoramus, Sc. II, 6. Quid illud est quod jure vixit et injuria, etc.?

Act II, sc. 7, Ignoramus appears with the six hundred gulden which he had pledged Torcol for Rosabella. Trico meets him, and in order to win time, for Cupes and Antonius to complete their arrangements, he represents that he would like to retain him as his counselor in a ludicrous case which he invents.

When at last the lawyer becomes insistent upon seeing Torcol, then as a faithful client and friend, Trico tells him what he has heard, namely that Antonius, his rival, had solemnly vowed to castrate him.

This scene has none corresponding to it in *La Trappolaria*. It and the following scene were, however, an easy development from the Italian source. There the captain, Dragoleone, did not go in person to claim Felesia, as he intended; while Ignoramus goes first in person, meets with shameful defeat, and later sends Dulman also. The following passages show influence from *Return from Parnassus*.

Ret. from Par., II, Sc. IV, 2, l. 1638. Good Master Recorder, let me retaine you this terme for my cause, for my cause good master Recorder.

Ignoramus, Sc. II, 7.—TRI. Hui, ut movantur. Detinendus ille est mihi nugis interim. . . . Tuum exspecto consilium, Domine.

Ret. from Par., II, Sc. IV, 2, l. 1642. It is his meaning I should come off: why here is the true stile of a villaine, the true faith of a lawyer: it is usuall with them to be bribed on the one side, and then to take a fee of the other.

Ignoramus, Sc. II, 7.—TRI. Danda est offa cerebro: quid agam? nummos hic aliquot subaeratos habeo; eos ei obtrudere certum est.

Ret. from Par., II, Sc. IV, 1, l. 1536. It is a plaine case, whereon I mooted in our temple, and that was this: put case there be three bretheren, John a Nokes, John a Nash, and John a Stile: John a Nokes the elder, John a Nash the younger, John a Stile the youngest of all, John a Nash the younger dyeth without issue of his body lawfully begotten: whether shall his lands ascend to John a Nokes the elder or descend to John a Stile the youngest of all? The lands do collaterally descend, not ascend.

Ignoramus, Sc. II, 7.—IGNO. Revera ibi est punctum: nam hic est casus tuus. Si John a Nokes inkeossat, John a Stiles de Black-acre, et John a Stiles capit Black-acre et White-acre, en ce cas tout est void, tout, tout.

In Act II, sc. 8, while Ignoramus and Trico yet tarry, Antonius comes forward uttering threats and with him comes Cupes blowing his terrorizing horn. Ignoramus in great fright conceals himself behind the mantle of his new and crafty client, Trico. When discovered, the lawyer readily promises to press his suit for Rosabella no further. He is accordingly released, but as he runs hastily away he says, “monstrabo tricem de lege.

Quoniam juravi, non ibo ipse, sed mittam clericum meum Dulman pro Rosabella." The three accomplices laugh heartily. Trico now recommends Antonius to take precaution against a new danger, and have a birth-mark painted upon his cheek, so that he may be ready to play the role of his London brother Antoninus, in case he should meet his father.

This scene also, like the two preceding ones, is original. The horn, as instrument of terror, is used in *Don Quixote*, Part I, Chapters II and XLI; also several times in the second part.

For the gelding motive, so prominent in this scene, compare *Return from Parnassus*, Pt. II, Act II, Sc. 3, l. 656; also *Middleton's Blurt*, II, II, 63b.

In Act III, sc. 1, Trico remains and receives Dulman, who at once appears with the signed contract and money for Rosabella. Trico represents himself to be Torcol's servant, and successfully entertains the messenger, while Cupes attires himself to play the role of Torcol.

The scene just described is in fable similar to Act III, Sc. 1, of *La Trappolaria*. The following speeches have verbal similarity.

<i>Dent.</i> Veggio un giovane, lo dimanderò.	<i>Dul.</i> Video unum ibi, demandabo, etc.
<i>Dent.</i> . . . O huomo da bene!	<i>Dul.</i> . . . Oh honeste vir!
<i>Trap.</i> Come ti chiami?	Trico Quid tibi itidem?
<i>Trap.</i> Conosci tu questa da che mano è scritta?	<i>Trico.</i> . . . at scin' ejus sit haec scriptio?
<i>Dent.</i> Conosco benissimo. Del Capitan. Dragoleone.	<i>Dul.</i> Est manus mei magistri.
<i>Dent.</i> Chiama il tuo padrone, che mi consegna la donna.	<i>Dul.</i> Sed quaeso jam clama magistrum tuum huc, ad dandum mihi liberaturam Rosabellae.

Act III, sc. 2, adds Cupes to the company of the preceding one. He comes forth having his neck twisted and is also dressed like Torcol. He talks Portuguese with his servant, Trico; and these two so thoroughly deceive Dulman, that he delivers over to them the money, the contract and the secret sign, whereby Torcol was to know the true servant of Ignoramus. They treat Dulman plentifully to wine, and Cupes implores him to have an oversight, that Rosabella-Polla shall be well treated at the hands of his master.

This scene has the following verbal correspondence with Act III, Sc. 2, of the Italian source.

Fag. Dove sono i denari?

Cupes. Scilicet; at, signor, attulisti, Signor?

Dent. Nella borsa.

Dul. Ouy, Ouy Magister meus misit tibi sexcentas coronas hic.

Fag. Tra tanto dammi la lettera . . . Quale è il segnale? Qui sta il fatto?

Cupes. Mane paululum. Indica mihi primum Quid Secreti id Signi est.

Dent. Che ti tocchi la punta del naso.

Dul. . . . Est mihi vellere te per nasum.

Fag. Giovane mio di gratia falle carezze, che le merita certo. Me l'ho elevata come figlia, e hor, che si parte, par che mi si schianti il cuore, . . . però ti priego, che ti sia raccomandata, e prega il Signor Capitano, da mia parte, che le faccia carezze.

Cup. Meis verbis herum ora quaeso ut Rosabellam bene et amanter curet: nam ego illam pro filia educavi mihi. Cor uritur nunc, cum ejus abitum cogito, verum illam in deliciis habebit, scio, scio.

In Act III, sc. 3, Polla comes forth weeping, and is dressed to represent Rosabella. She exchanges with Cupes, presumably her uncle, expressions of tender affection and grief, in parting from him. She is then given into the care of Dulman, now half drunk, to convey to Ignoramus.

The following speeches of this scene have corresponding ones in Act III, Sc. 3, of La Trappolaria.

Fag. Felesia mia v'è di buona voglia, non piagere, che verro a vederti spesso, e domani verro in golea a visitare Signor Capitano.

Cup. Rosabella, cognata mia, filia potius, huic te nunc dedo, quo is ad virum te deducat tuum. Jamne a me abitura animula mea? proh dolor! at tu ne fleas, obsecro.

Gab. Padron mio, io mi parto molto addogliata da voi, che se ben v'è in parte, dove mi faranno fatto carezze, tuttavolta havea affettion con voi, come di padre.

Pal. Patrue mi, mi pater potius, quanquam illi nubam, ubi bene mihi erit — attamen abs te abscedere —.

Fag. V'è figlia in buona hora m'hai mosso le lachrime di tenerezza.

Cup. Lacrimam excussit mihi.

Tra. Dentifrangolo v'è, con Deo.

Cup. Senior, vale, vale.

In Act III, sc. 4, Cupes and Trico tarry and rejoice over their triumph. Trico then directs Cupes to attire himself as

Dulman to carry the six hundred gulden which they had just received, to Torcol and get the true Rosabella. Trico himself proceeds to Torcol's house to occupy him there until Cupes as Dulman shall appear.

This scene follows the fable of *La Trappolaria*, Act III, Sc. 3, in the latter half.

Fag. Anzi avanzaeremo di bene in meglio.

Trap. Horsù non perdiam tempo. Va a vestirti di Soldato, e con la borsa, con la lettera chiusa, e co'l segnale anderai al Ruffiano, e ti farai dar Felesia.

Trap. Io hora me ne vò al Ruffiano, e mostrerò trattar con lui alcun partito, e tu verrai su'l meglio, per farlo star più forte all'inganno, tu non lasciar di far sempre il tuo ufficio, e mostra adivarti meco.

Fag. Io vo a vestirmi.

Trap. Et io a trattar co'l Ruffiano, e sia presto per qualche mala-ventura. Tic, toc.

Cup. . . . Ibo nunc, atque aliud ornatum capiam. Dulman esse assimilabo me.

Tri. . . . nosti Signum? . . . Aurum ferto hoc, et syngrapham etiam.

Tri. . . . ad Torcol ego huic continuo confero me. Simulabo ei aliquam conditionem ferre quae in rem suam siet; optima ubi est occasio, tu interveni —.

Cup. Jam eo ornamentum me.

Trico. Ego ad Torcol: domi ne non sit vereor. Tic, toc.

Act III, sc. 5, brings Trico into the presence of Torcol, entreating him for the hand of Surda in marriage; he also informs him that Antonius has found rich treasures, with which to ransom Rosabella; but Torcol knows Trico already all too well, and will hear none of his overtures. Trico, therefore, turns upon him and heaps maledictions upon his head.

In Act III, sc. 6, Cupes appears, dressed to represent Dulman. From his speech and garments of a clerk, Torcol believes him to be no other than the appointed messenger of Ignoramus. Trico warns him that this is not the clerk of the lawyer; nevertheless because Cupes counts out to him the proper number of gold pieces and gives the Pimp's nose a generous twist, the latter is thoroughly convinced that there is no error, so he gives Rosabella into his care. Trico hurries away to be on the watch for Ignoramus.

The fifth and sixth scenes just described follow entirely the plot of *La Trappolaria* in Act III, Sc. 4. There is here perhaps a closer following of the Italian text than usual. However, much is, as ever, entirely original in expression.

In Act III, sc. 7, Cupes converses with Rosabella, while he conducts her to his own house, as a place for safe keeping. Here he leaves her alone, while he hastens off to the inn.

The plan of this scene is that of *La Trappolaria*, Act III, Sc. 6; however, the subject of conversation is often entirely different, so that there is little correspondence in language.

Act III, sc. 8, gives us a view once more into the camp of the lawyer, where all is confusion and excitement. Dulman, fearing the consequences of leading Polla into the presence of his master, has hidden away and allowed the woman to make her entrée alone. When Dulman can no where be found, Ignoramus vents his wrath upon Polla herself. Incensed at being stigmatised "hagga, sorciera, saga, maga, malefica" and the like, the irate Amazon draws off a slipper and attacks her calumniator with such fury, that he quickly cries for quarter. But because he intersperses his threats and alternate pleas for mercy with numerous Latin law-phrases, which are beyond the comprehension of Polla, the latter argues to herself, that he is talking nonsense and must be possessed of an evil spirit, and therefore as she wends her way homeward, she reports to all her neighbors, that Ignoramus is a demoniac.

This scene which we have just described has its counterpart, as far as plot is concerned, in *La Trappolaria*, Act III, Sc. 7. There, however, the quarrel was only one of words. The whipping which Polla inflicts upon Ignoramus is a Quixotic incident. The motive to make the lawyer possessed, which is introduced in this scene, and which ends in his exorcism in Sc. IV, 11, is also primarily an influence from *Don Quixote*. (See below, Act IV, Sc. 11, p. 53.) The three following speeches have verbal correspondence with *La Trappolaria*.

Drag. Tu dunque sei la mia vez-
zosa e gratiosa Felesia?

Gab. Io son Felesia, sì.

Gab. Vò andarmene a casa, l'uscio
è chiuso, feci errore a lasciargli
le chiavi, e non portarmele meco,
Batterò, forse vi fusse tic, toc.

Ign. Quae *misprisio*, quae *dis-*
pargatio est haec? in nomine dia-
boli quae es tu?

Pal. Sum Rosabella, senior.

Pat. At oclusa janua est. Feci
male quod claves haud abstulerim;
sed forsan aliquis intus est. Put-
tabo, Tic, toc, tic, toc.

When Polla, Act III, sc. 9, reaches home and raps at the barred door, to her surprise and indignation, a strange woman appears at the window. Polla believes this to be no other than a mistress of her husband. She, therefore, stigmatizes her with the coarsest epithets. She tries to force an entrance to the house, but failing in this, she makes a tour of the inns in search of her dissolute husband to make him pay atonement for his sins.

This scene and Act III, Sc. 8, of *La Trappolaria* are entirely similar in fable, and the likeness in phraseology is rather greater than usual. This scene in *La Trappolaria* is in imitation of the well-known scene in the "*Mercator*" of Plautus, wherein Dorippa mistakes Pasicompsa for her rival.

In Act III, sc. 10, Polla finds Cupes at an inn engaged in lively conversation with musicians, whom he had hired to add merriment to the banquet which he was about to enjoy with his clerical drink-fellows. Polla, from without, hears her husband, the innkeeper and fiddlers making many a derogatory jest at her expense. Finally all join in singing the following song of her husband's own composition: "Cupis uxor Polla || O si frangat colla! || Polla, || Colla; || Dispareat, || Intereat. || Uxores pari sorte || Pereant pari morte; || sorte, || Morte; || Dispareant, || Intereant." || Polla now no longer restrains her pent-up anger, but breaks in upon the company, overturns the tables laden with viands now ready for the feast, pours out the wine, and inflicts sore chastisement upon her calumniators. Then with dire threats she requires her husband to give her the house-key and follow her home. Thither she hastens and without mercy turns Rosabella out of the house.

The scene we have just related has its essential conception in *La Trappolaria*, Act III, Scenes 9 and 10; however, the plan and tone are considerably altered. While in our drama the events transpire as above related, in the Italian drama Fagone remained at home, after he had brought Felesia thither; and was there to receive and quarrel with his wife, when she reached the house. In the tenth scene, when the cook comes to the house to make preparations for the feast, which Fagone expected to celebrate with the strange woman, then Gabrina's wrath was so stirred that she ended in driving Felesia out of doors.

The introduction of musicians in our drama, and the placing of the scene in the inn makes the conversation assume quite another tone. There is here almost no verbal correspondence with *La Trappolaria*. The song in this scene is written in Skeltonian verse.

Act III, sc. 11 brings Antonius to the house of Cupes in hope of seeing there his Rosabella. He is thrown almost into despair, when Cupes informs him, how Polla had expelled Rosabella from the house. As Aeneas sought his Creusa, so Antonius goes forth again to seek, he knows not where, his beloved.

This scene may be said to be a condensation of Act IV, Sc. 2, of *La Trappolaria*. Only a few speeches have no counterpart in the Italian drama; however, what claims five pages in the original is in our drama contained within the limits of a little more than one.

Act III, sc. 12, presents to us, on one part of the stage Rosabella complaining of her fate. At the same time, on another part, Antonius unseen by the former continues his search and complains of his ill-fortune, while on still another part Cupes bitterly laments the loss of his sumptuous feast.

In Act III, sc. 13, as a closing scene to the third act Ignoramus comes again in search of Torcol, but, as Cupes sees the lawyer approach, he remembers to blow his horn, and the enemy hastily recedes.

This episode has no correspondent in the Italian drama. (See above, Sc. II, 8.)

Act IV opens with the reunion of Antonius and Rosabella. After a brief but hearty greeting, the former at once unfolds to his beloved Trico's plan, by which they may enjoy the comfort and security of Theodorus' home. The plan is this, that they shall represent to the father, that they are the recently married Antoninus and Catharine; and that they have just come from London. To this end Antonius had had painted upon his cheek a birthmark like that of his brother. They must also speak English.

This scene just described and Scene 12 of the third Act follow the plot of *La Trappolaria*, Act IV, Sc. 3. In both scenes only nine speeches are directly dependent upon the Italian source.

While they yet discuss the plan, the father Theodorus, Act

IV, sc. 2, appears. He can scarcely be induced to believe that the young man, with whom he speaks, is not his son Antonius: Yet because of the birthmark, and because Antonius had brought for him letters from Dorothea (which however Trico had composed), and because the pair speak English, he is finally convinced that they are in reality his children from London, Antoninus and Catharine.

This scene follows entirely the plot of *La Trappolaria*, Act IV, Sc. 4. The language in this scene is, however, independent of the original.

Act IV, sc. 3, adds Trico to the company of the foregoing scene. Though the contriver of the deception, he now appears reluctant to believe that there is not here some mistake. In order to gain confidence with Theodorus he does what he can to make him believe that these are not Antoninus and Catharine. At last, however, Trico pretends also to be convinced. When all is peace, Trico and Antonius see Pyropus, the tailor coming, which fills them both with great uneasiness. Trico withdraws to avail himself once more of Cupes' assistance.

The first third of this scene bears some verbal likeness to the same part of Act IV, Sc. 5, of the Italian source. The remainder of the scene is similar only in plot.

Act IV, sc. 4, brings Pyropus into the presence of the father and son muttering complaints because of the worthless ring which Trico and Antonius had imposed upon him and lays claim to the clothes which Antonius is now wearing. The young man continues to speak English, and declares to his father that he does not know the man. Nevertheless the father has now grave suspicions in reference to the affair. Finally Antonius is almost in despair of longer keeping up the deception.

This scene corresponds in plan to Act IV, Sc. 6, of the Italian source. However, instead of the tailor going away, at end of scene, to appeal to law, as in *La Trappolaria*, in our drama he remains during the following scene, there to be further undone by Trico and Cupes. Possibly one third of the speeches in this scene are in imitation of corresponding ones in the original.

At the critical moment, Trico, Act IV, sc. 5, returns, accompanied by Cupes dressed as a sailor. The latter demands money of the young man for his passage from England. The father is now again convinced, that this is in reality his son from London, he therefore generously pays the sailor twenty crowns. Moreover because Pyropus obstinately refuses to be convinced that this is any other than Antonius, Cupes becomes angry and threatens to thrash the tailor. By this means the latter is frightened away; but as he retires he threatens to appeal to law for justice. Trico now realizes that Ignoramus would soon be coming to reclaim his money or Rosabella; therefore acting upon the report, which Polla had circulated, namely that the lawyer was possessed, he suggests to Cupes that they be ready to exorcise him, when he appear. As a party to aid in this task Cupes suggests his drink-comrade, Cola, the monk.

This scene, like the preceding, is in a measure dependent upon Act IV, Sc. 6, of *La Trappolaria*; yet the phraseology and even the conception of it are essentially original.

While they yet speak of Cola, in Act IV, sc. 6, he appears and requests Cupes, as book-vender, to sell a cowl and books, which he had just won at dice from a brother monk. He promises Cupes that they shall then enjoy together from the proceeds a rare banquet. The greetings of the monk and Cupes, as they meet, are interesting. Cup. "O, mi confessor. | Col. O, mi confessor. | Cup. Mi spiritualis pater. | Col. Mi carnalis frater. | Cup. Bibemus molle vinum. | Col. Sed cyathum ter trinum." When Cupes requests the monk to exorcise Ignoramus, he readily consents.

This scene just described has none corresponding to it in *La Trappolaria*. The satire of the monk as well as the few short verses in this scene suggest Skelton's satires, directed against a debased clergy.

Act IV, sc. 7, transfers us again to the quarters of Ignoramus, who has just succeeded in recapturing his clerk, Dulman. The lawyer heaps censure upon the unfortunate servant. The latter however declares to his master that he had delivered to him the same Rosabella, which he had received from Torcol.

This scene follows the plot of *La Trappolaria*, Act IV, Sc. 7, and has with it also the following similarities of speech.

<p><i>Drag.</i> . . . poichè in iscambio di recarmi la mia Felesia mi rechi quella vecchia contrafatta.</p> <p><i>Den.</i> V'ho recata quella istessa, che, mi consegnò il Ruffiano.</p> <p><i>Drag.</i> Come lo conoscesti?</p>	<p><i>Ign.</i> Quid ergo non portasti Rosa- bellam mihi?</p> <p><i>Dal.</i> Illam Rosabellam portabam quam Torcol deliberabat mihi.</p> <p><i>Ign.</i> . . . num habebat curvum collum?</p>
--	---

Ignoramus had in the meantime sent Pecus to Torcol, to claim the true Rosabella. Torcol however believed this to be only another stroke of Trico, therefore he casts the messenger into a dungeon and then exultantly proceeds to Ignoramus. In Act IV, sc. 8, the two men meet, and after comparing notes they both realize how completely they have been outwitted. Ignoramus threatens Torcol for embezzling money from him and unjustly casting his clerk into prison. Torcol pleads innocence, and, finally, they agree to go to Theodorus to see if they can learn from him the authors of this strategem of which they have been the victims.

This scene just described is in plot entirely similar to Act IV, Sc. 8, of *La Trappolaria*. It has, however, almost no verbal correspondence with it.

Act IV, sc. 9, presents to us the father, Theodorus, and Rosabella sitting before the door of his house engaged in conversation. As the girl sees her uncle, Torcol, in company with Ignoramus and Dulman draw nigh, she is naturally filled with anxiety. Nevertheless, when they wish to lay claim to her as Rosabella, she plays well her role by continuing to speak English; and protests that her name is Catharine. Antonius is summoned. He also appears as Antoninus and suggests to his father that these are the possessed men of whom they had heard.

This scene which we have just described is a condensation of the fable as it is contained in the ninth, tenth and eleventh scenes of *La Trappolaria*, Act 4. The principal difference in plan is herein; that at the end of scene 11 in *La Trappolaria* the Captain and Ruffiano are frightened away by Arsenio drawing a dagger and threatening them; while in Ruggle's drama, at the end of scene 9, Ignoramus, Torcol and Dulman remain to be treated, in the following scene, by

the Monk and his exorcisers. There is in this scene almost no verbal likeness with the Italian piece.

In Act IV, sc. 10, Trico, Cupes, and Cola, led by Polla, appear, to the great relief of Antonius. Polla designates Ignoramus as the demoniac, and says that Torcol is also another of the same stamp. Theodorus believes the story, and, accompanied by Antonius and Rosabella, retires within the house. The exorcisers then lay hold upon Ignoramus. Torcol is frightened and flees.

In Act IV, sc. 11, they bind Ignoramus to a chair, and frighten away Dulman by a threat to exorcise him also. They regard the lawyer's remonstrances, always uttered in his characteristic jargon, as additional evidence of his being thoroughly possessed. In punishment of every Latin law-phrase, which the lawyer introduces into his speeches, they apply to him the rigorous rites of exorcism, as though they were so many evil spirits. Because he does not yield to the treatment, but still remains incorrigible, Cola, the monk, bids him to be conveyed away to his monastery, where he may receive more extreme treatment. Because of the brave part which Cupes had taken against the lawyer, his wife's calumniator, Polla is proud of him, and man and wife go away to the inn together, reunited in the bonds of peace.

Scenes 10 and 11, which we have just described seem indeed to be original. Exorcism was one of the most common of events in England during the reigns of Queen Elisabeth and King James. The binding to a chair and such questioning as we have in this scene was the set order for such a ceremony. (For an incident of exorcism during the reign of Elisabeth see *Revue bleue*, 4, ser. I, 1894, p. 656, translated from 19th Cen. Magazine.) The conception of this mode of treatment seems to have been also influenced by "the strange and wonderful way in which Don Quixote was enchanted" (Chap. XXXVIII), where monks also execute the means of torment.

For somewhat similar means of torture we may compare *Return from Parnassus* II, sc. IV, 2, and Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*, sc. IV, 2, also *Comedy of Errors*, Act IV, sc. 4. As another example of possession we may compare also the pretended madness of Edgar in *King Lear*, scs. III, 4, 6, and sc. IV, 1.

In Act IV, sc. 12, Trico and Antonius come before us and are at once dismayed to see Pyropus, accompanied by constables, drawing near for their arrest. When seized both Trico and Antonius deny that they have any acquaintance with each other. Trico is released because of his assurances to the tailor. Antonius is about to be carried away to prison, but when he realizes that all will be lost, if this happen, he draws his sword, frees himself and puts his enemies to flight.

The plan of this scene is, on the whole, the same as that of Act IV, Sc. 12, of *La Trappolaria*. However, it is, as ever, executed in another manner. The following speeches have some verbal likeness.

Tra. Che volete voi, che cercate da me?

Pol. Vò che venghi prigionero, o restituiscimi le robbe.

Tra. Ecco quì il padrone, dimandale a lui: io sono un povero servo.

Tri. Perii: quid me vultis?

Pyr. In carcerem eas, vel mea mihi restitutas ornamenta; jam captus es.

Tu. Eccum ipsum herum, ab ipso poscito; servus ego sum.

Act V introduces new complications, because Dorothea, the wife of Theodorus, accompanied by Antoninus and Catharine, does now actually arrive from London. Owing to the ill-effects of the voyage upon Catharine, she and Antoninus remain at the harbor, while Dorothea, accompanied by two attendants, Nell her maid and Vince her page, proceeds to seek her husband's house in Bordeaux. While the wife anxiously awaits, in his drawing room, her husband's appearance, Vince indulges in vulgar jesting with Nell.

The first ten verses of this scene are a condensation of Sc. V, 1, of *La Trappolaria*. The remainder of this scene, as also the following, consist in a dialogue between Vince and Nell, which are new characters and whose conversation has no counterpart in the Italian source.

Act V, sc. 2, Vince and Nell continue their jokes until they see Ignoramus approaching, when Vince exclaims: "Go, yonder comes a mad man."

This scene is original. Vince is the type of fool common to Shakespeare and other Elizabethan dramatists. Both his name and the

manner in which he takes part in the action in tormenting Ignoramus suggest a hidden reference to the parent of the Elizabethan fool, namely, the Vice of the old morality play, a character which sometimes aided, at the end of the play, in tormenting the devil.

Act V, sc. 3, presents to us Ignoramus in company with his clerks. He relates how they treated him in the Monastery, and how he made his escape. He indulges also in threats as to how he will yet have revenge.

This scene is also new. It may have its conception also in "Twelfth Night," Act V, sc. 1, in which Malvolio tells Olivia how he had been dealt with, and utters threats against all his enemies.

In Act V, sc. 4, Trico comes near where Theodorus and Dorothea are engaged in intimate conversation. The faithful intriguer is once more dismayed; for he hears Dorothea assure her husband that the true Antoninus and the true Catharine are tarrying at the port. Theodorus now summons the pretended Catharine to appear. Trico draws nearer, that he may overhear the result of Rosabella's approaching trial.

This scene just related follows the plot of the latter part of Act V, Sc. 2, of *La Trappolaria*. The first part of the scene in the Italian piece is occupied with the mutual recognition of man and wife after their fifteen years' separation. In our drama Trico sees Theodorus and Dorothea already in each other's embrace.

In Act V, sc. 5, Rosabella comes forward and resolutely asserts that she is Catharine. When however Dorothea proves the falsity of her claim, the girl bursts into tears, confesses the entire deception and explains that she is already the wife of Antonius. Theodorus believing the family name to be disgraced through such an alliance, is now thoroughly enraged. Though Rosabella pleads an honorable origin and purity of character, nevertheless Theodorus so ladens her with threats, that she would welcome death.

Act V, Sc. 5, corresponds in fable with the first part of Act V, Sc. 3, of *La Trappolaria*. The exposition of the deception, which Rosabella here gives, is set forth in the Italian piece, in scene 5, by Trappola himself, when he had accomplished his final purpose.

In Act V, sc. 6, Theodorus entreats Bannacar, his moorish servant, to put Rosabella to death. The servant objects, remind-

ing his master of his Christian principles. Rosabella now recognizes in Bannacar the former slave of her own father Alphonso, who, as he was about to die at Fessa, presented his slave with freedom. Bannacar therefore the more steadfastly declines to execute his master's wish. When Theodorus still insists, Rosabella, now overcome by grief and fear, swoons away in a faint. Trico, who has overheard all, hastens away to inform Antonius of this situation.

This scene and all the following ones are developed in quite a different manner from the remaining history of *La Trappolaria*, even though incidents here and there in the two dramas have similarities. That part of the scene above described, in which Bannacar relates the history of Rosabella's life and which he gives more fully in the next scene, has its counterpart to some extent in the narrative of her own life, which Felesia gives in the first part of Act V, Sc. 3, of *La Trappolaria*. Otherwise this scene is new in plan. It has no verbal correspondence with the Italian piece.

In Act V, sc. 7, Antonius arrives. Seeing Rosabella lying in a faint, he at once concludes that his father had in reality caused the death of his beloved. His grief is now so great that he wishes to take his own life. However Rosabella begins to revive and the father also shows some evidence of compassion. When Rosabella had recovered, Antonius implores his father's favor upon his marriage with Rosabella. Somewhat penitent of his cruel conduct, the father now inquires more particularly into the girl's origin. Rosabella herself relates that she had been the daughter of Alphonsus, a Portuguese noble, and that when dying at Fessa, her father had entrusted her to the care of her uncle, Rodrigo Torcol. She relates further that the latter, while coasting along France had suffered shipwreck and lost all his fortune, after which he had remained in this country and had begun business here in Bordeaux. Bannacar, who is now asked for his knowledge of the matter, answers that the girl has spoken the truth so far as she knew it. He asserts however that Rosabella was not the daughter of Alphonsus, as she supposed, and then proceeds to tell what had been until that time a secret history. He relates that he himself had formerly been a servant to a Moorish merchant named Urtado, and that, as

they were in English waters near Detfordia on the Thames, a nurse, named Ursula, with a child named Isabella (the daughter of a London alderman named Manlius and his wife Dorothea), had been enticed upon board the ship, and then borne away from their native land. The nurse had died at sea, but the child then four years old was carried to Portugal and there sold to Alphonsus, who, having no children, adopted her and reared her as his own daughter. These utterances of Bannacar convince the parents that Rosabella can be no other than their own long lost child. If any doubts remained they were dispersed when Bannacar produced a signet, which he had long treasured, and which, marked A. & I. (for Antonius and Isabella), Theodorus recognizes as the identical one which he years before had given the child Isabella as a token of her betrothal to Antonius. Theodorus has naturally no further objections to the union which he himself had arranged and therefore accords both his children his fullest favor.

This scene, as above related, differs in plan essentially from that of Act V, Sc. 4, of *La Trappolaria*, where Trappola comes and falsely announces the shipwreck, and certain death of Arsenio, which causes the father Callifrone to suffer remorse, and also renders him willing to pay Trappola any amount of money for the recovery of his son Arsenio, exactly what Trappola wished to accomplish. Again, while the recognition in *Ignoramus* is effected through the testimony of Bannacar and the signet, in *La Trappolaria* it was already effected at the beginning of scene 3, simply through the story of Filesia herself and a mother's and daughter's intuitive power of recognition.

In Act V, sc. 8, Theodorus expresses his sincere gratitude to Trico and Bannacar, and handsomely rewards them both. Vince comes and announces the arrival of Antoninus and Catharine from the harbor.

This scene finds its essential conception, like the preceding, in Act V, Sc. 4, of *La Trappolaria*. There is, however, no verbal correspondence.

In Act V, sc. 9, Pyropus, the tailor comes once more, whom Antonius receives kindly, and renders him his full dues for the use of his costume. Vince is also present and acts the clown and dare-devil.

This scene finds its conception in *La Trappolaria*, Act V, Sc. 6, where the tailor comes also, and is kindly received. Vince's speeches, as in all other scenes of our drama, have no counterpart in the Italian piece.

Act V, sc. 10, brings Ignoramus and Torcol again upon the stage. When they hear the full story of Rosabella-Isabella's life and when the 600 gold pieces are returned to them, they both relinquish all further claim to Rosabella, and agree to cause no more interference. However Ignoramus is not allowed to retire entirely in peace. The boy Vince intersperses all the speeches of the scene with most sarcastic remarks directed against the lawyer, and, after several attempts, finally succeeds in pinning a fox-tail behind the lawyer's back. When Dulman attempts to defend his master against such insults, Vince turns upon him, pelts him with stones, and then runs away.

This scene as well as the two remaining ones have no counterpart in *La Trappolaria*. The stone-throwing in this scene, as a means of contempt, might find its analogy in *Timon of Athens*, scenes III, 6, and IV, 3; but stone-throwing is also a most common incident in *Don Quixote*.

Act V, sc. 11, presents Polla in search of Cupes, whom she had heard to be at the inn in company with Cola and women of ill-repute. Cupes fears his wife and as he sees her approaching, hides behind the mantle of his confessor, the monk. The latter promises to deny that he knows anything of his whereabouts. The Amazon of a woman arrives, and first scourges unmercifully the female companions of her husband, and drives them out of the house. Then in her conversation with Cola, through open enticement of the monk and her allusions to their past relations, it becomes very evident that neither she nor the monk are of guiltless character. When the wife has convicted herself, her husband comes forth from his hiding-place and accuses her. Because both man and wife are of one stripe, they make peace, and ask the benediction of the corrupt monk.

In Act V, sc. 12, Cupes and Trico come forward and relate,

with some spirit of rivalry, what parts each of them had performed during the course of the play. Instead of one speaking an epilogue, they in turn praise the merits of the king and fill their cups in his honor. They then call down the following curses upon all those who will not render his majesty hearty allegiance.

Trico. . . . uxores Polla infestiores habeant.

Cupes. Iidemque stupido Dulman stupidiores, et inficeto Ignoramo audiant infictiores.

Trico. Iidemque, opera carnificis, torto collo sient, magis quam ipse Torcol.

Then each exultant in his success drains his glass, first however calling upon the entire audience to drink with them to the health of the king. "Salute Domini nostri, pii, felicis, semper Augusti." They invite applause and the curtain falls.

The curtain rises once more, and in the midst of uproarious applause, Ignoramus comes forth and cries Silence! Peace! Peace! He endeavors in vain to appeal to the sympathy and protection of the king. The uproar continues and again he bids, though in vain, the audience cease its laughter and applause.

SUMMARY.

1. INFLUENCES FROM LA TRAPPOLARIA.

We have observed that the main plot of the comedy Ignoramus is essentially identical with that of La Trappolaria. The comparison of dramatis personae of the two dramas, page —, shows that every character of the Italian drama has a corresponding one in Ruggle's drama. This does not, however, exclude the fact that the author of Ignoramus displayed great originality in his freedom from the language of his source and also in the additions which he made to it. Of the fifty-five scenes, which compose the comedy Ignoramus, thirty-seven follow, with slight modifications the story of La Trappolaria. Interspersed among these, eighteen new scenes have been added, which have no correspondence with the Italian source. These newly introduced scenes are the two prologues and scenes I, 3, 4, 5; II, 6, 7, 8; III, 13; IV, 5, 6, 10, 11; V, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12.

There are also seven new characters added to the *dramatis personae* of Ignoramus who have no part in the Italian source, while several others, particularly the one corresponding to Ignoramus, is so changed that they are practically new creations.

2. NEW FEATURES IN IGNORAMUS AND THEIR SOURCES.

(a) *The Figure Ignoramus.*

As far as the plot of *La Trappolaria* reaches, the sea-captain, Dragleone, is the prototype for the lawyer Ignoramus. Dragleone was, however, not the central figure of the Italian drama, he was the unfortunate victim of the intrigues of Trappola, ridicule of him was not the first purpose of the author. On the other hand, the primal purpose of the new scenes of Ignoramus was to take the almost silent sea-captain of *La Trappolaria* and transform him into the ignorant, self-conceited, pedantic, language-mongering lawyer, to make of him a mock-hero, who should become the figure of central interest, give the drama his name, and who should only be outdone in roguery by Trico—the Trappola (the deceiver), the hero of *La Trappolaria*. The author of Ignoramus drew the materials for these additions in part from life in part from various literary sources.

The lawyer had been a favorite object for ridicule, since the time of Henry VIII, when Skelton, in his morality entitled, "The Necromancer," directed his missiles against the clergy and the lawyers. We have in a previous chapter noted the relation of the comedy Ignoramus to the Cambridge plays "Club Law"; "The Pilgrimage to Parnassus"; and "The Return from Parnassus," wherein the lawyer was the butt of ridicule. Following these might be mentioned also other comedies wherein the satire against lawyers is cutting. Such are Jonson's "Volpone," 1605, with its advocate Voltore; John Day's "Law Tricks," 1608; and Thomas Middleton's "A Trick to Catch the Old One," also 1608, in which is the character of a lawyer named Dampit; also derisive character sketches such as "A mere Common Lawyer," by Thomas Overbury. Earlier than "Club Law," about 1594, according to Professor Wolfgang Keller, appeared the non-Shakespearean drama entitled Richard

II,¹ which has not only the laughable figure of the lawyer Tressillian, but which may have also suggested to Ruggle the name of his hero, Ignoramus. The character Mr. Ignorance, bayliff of Dunstable (here an allegorical place mentioned also in both prologues to the comedy Ignoramus),² is prominent in this drama and speaks sc. III, 3, also of his brother, Master Ignoramus. It is probable, however, that the term Ignoramus had long been a common term of opprobrium for an ignorant person.³

This lawyer Ignoramus of Ruggle's drama is introduced, sc. I, 3, in the role of the "pedant in love" (for history of this character see Creizenach's *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, Bd. II, s. 280). Mr. Ruggle seems to have been influenced in this respect especially by the Latin drama "Pedantius" enacted also in the presence of Cambridge scholars, according to Prof. Smith as early as 1581. (See edit. of *Ped.*, p. x.)⁴ One of the differentiating features of *Pedantius* from other dramas of its genus is the manner in which its hero uses in his conversations with his three pupils, in his wooing of Lydia, on all occasions a multitude of academical saws and philosophical phrases. In exactly the same peculiar manner Ignoramus inserts into his intercourse with his three clerks as well as into his passionate love-suit of Rosabella a mass of legal terms and phrases.

In other new scenes of Ruggle's drama this same pedantic figure is led into disgraceful company and ludicrous situations. In sc. I, 4, he is given an entertainment by Torcol, the bawd, and his girls somewhat as in the *Pseudolus* (the principal source

¹ Shakespear Jahrbuch, Bd. XXXV.

² For significance of Dunstable consult Shakespear Jahrbuch, Vol. 35, p. 42.

³ The New Eng. Dict. attributes the first use of this term applied to designate a person to Ruggles drama, but aside from the reference given above it had been used in this sense a full century earlier by Erasmus in his "Encomium Moriae" (Praise of Folly) also by Beaumont and Fletcher in "The Honest Man's Fortune," s.c. v, 3, just two years before the first performance of Ignoramus, comp. Shakespear Jahrbuch, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 256 and 276: also New Eng. Dict.

⁴ Comp. above p. 36; also below p. 65, f.

for La Trappolaria) of Plautus, where Ballio, scene 2, lashes his slaves for the delectation of Calidorus. In scene I, 5, like Pedantius he pleads in motley speech his cause before the fair Rosabella. In scenes II, 6 and 7 Musaeus, the representative of the University, probably the Philomusus of the Parnassus dramas, ridicules and helps to baffle this enemy of school, state and church. In scene II, 8, Trico and Cupes threaten to castrate this arch-deceiver. In scene III, 8, aside from the quarrel of words as it is in La Trappolaria, this ardent lover is, because of his strangely mixed language, like Don Quixote, imputed to be mad and possessed, and receives in true Quixotic style a sound trouncing at the hands of the infuriated Polla. In scenes IV, 10 and 11 this unfortunate lover is again like Don Quixote attacked by Cola, the monk, and exorcised according to the rites of the Roman church and the custom of the time. In scene V, 3, Ignoramus gives his clerks Dulman and Pecus an account of these experiences. In scene V, 10, he is further tormented and made ridiculous by Vince, the fool.

(b) *The Figure of Cupes.*

Cupes, according to our comparison, page —, corresponds to Fagone of La Trappolaria, but in Ignoramus he is not merely a parasite, who delights only in eating; he is also a vender of books, whose conversation with Trico about his wares, sc. II, 3, reminds us of the condemnation of Don Quixote's library by the priest and barber. The hilarity of this character at the inn, sc. III, 10, by reason of his contemplated feast with his friends, his songs with musical accompaniment, his jests at his wife's expense and finally the trouncing, which he and the musicians receive at the hands of the Amazonian Polla, have no counterpart in La Trappolaria. This scene is also largely Quixotic. Cupes as the companion and assistant of the monk seems to bear, throughout the play, the same relation to Cola as the barber did to the priest in Don Quixote (see below under Cola, p. 63).

(c) *Musaeus.*

Musaeus as the representative of the university and the arts has no equivalent in La Trappolaria, but seems to have been

the lineal descendant of Philomusus, Academico and Studioso of the Parnassus dramas. Also Dulman and Pecus, although they correspond to Dentifrangolo and Leonetto as far as the carrying out of the main plot is concerned, are, in being opponents of Musaeus and academic learning, under the same influence. Dulman is only a translation of Stupido. The direct influence however upon these characters from the Parnassus plays is slight. These characters appear in the following scenes, which are unrelated to the story of La Trappolaria, viz: Scs. I, 3; II, 6; IV, 7, 11; V, 3, 10.

(d) *Cola, the Monk.*

The interesting figure of the debased monk is entirely foreign to the plot of La Trappolaria. His introduction into the play "Ignoramus" was first suggested by his friend Cupes, sc. IV, 5, in order to assist in the exorcism of the demented lawyer. The picture of this monk is not essentially unlike the pictures of the priest in John Heywood's interludes; though the parts, which he plays as the exorcisor of Ignoramus, scs. IV, 10, 11, seem to be those of the priest in Don Quixote, who, accompanied by the barber, was directly or indirectly the means of getting that hero in many of his difficulties. (For other examples of exorcism see above, p. 53.) The spirit of the satire reflected indirectly upon this character and the verses, which he and his friend Cupes use, suggest influence also from Skelton.

(e) *Bannacar and Richardus, Servants to Theodorus.*

These characters are entirely new, but they play very insignificant parts. The most important incidents are the conversion of Bannacar, the Moor, from Mohammedism to Christianity through the instrumentality of his master, Theodorus, and the refusal of this servant to comply with the cruel command of this same self-righteous master, viz: to kill Rosabella. See sc. V, 6.

(f) *Vince and Nell.*

These two attendants of Dorothea are of the fool type, common in Shakespear. They appear together, scs. V, 1 and 2.

Vince lends assistance also in scs. V, 8, 9, 10, to the ridiculing and tormenting of Ignoramus by means of his jests, throwing of stones and pinning of a fox-tail to the lawyer. Stone-throwing was an insult often employed in Don Quixote. Timon of Athens also used it as a means of showing contempt.

(g) *Surda*.

The falling in love of Surda, the credulous deaf-mute, with Trico forms an interesting incident of the drama, sc. I, 6, which has no counterpart in La Trappolaria.

VI. LITERARY INFLUENCE.

1. POEMS IN PRAISE OF THE COMEDY IGNORAMUS.

In connection with and following the first performance of the comedy Ignoramus, a number of poems were composed, of which the following are still extant.

A Cambridge madrigal, consisting of sixteen four-line strophes was composed as an answer to the poem, known as the Oxford ballad. The poem is entitled: "A Cambridge Madrigal in answer to the Oxford Ballad, as it was sung before the king, instead of Interlude music in Ignoramus, the second time acted before his majesty, in Trinity College Maii 13, 1615." A copy of this is preserved in the Brit. Mus. Sloane MSS., No. 1775. It is reprinted by Mr. Hawkins (ed. Igno., p. cxv).

Another poem of twenty-four verses draws a comparison between the entertainment of the king on his first visit to Cambridge and his previous visit to Oxford in 1605. The poem, although somewhat satirical towards both universities, is rather partial towards Cambridge. It is printed by Mr. Hawkins (ed. Igno., p. xxxvii).

A Latin poem, consisting of fifty-four verses, celebrates the second coming of the king to Cambridge. The title is as follows: "De Repetita Cantabrigia: Sive, De adventu Regis ad Musas secundo. Liber licentiatus."—A MS. copy of this poem is, according to Mr. Hawkins, preserved in Trinity College, Cambridge, B. 14, 22. It is also reprinted by him (ed. Igno., p. xliv).

Two poems were written as advertisements of the drama and accompany most of the editions after the first. One, written in macaronic form, consists of ten verses. It is entitled "Dulman in laudem Ignorami"; the other contains seventeen verses and bears the title "Encomiasticon in Ignoramum."

A poem of twenty-two verses prefixed to the first edition of a Latin drama entitled *Pedantius*, written in 1580–81 according to Prof. Moore Smith, but not published until 1631,

draws a comparison between the merits of the two dramas *Pedantius* and *Ignoramus*. The writer of these lines claims superior merit for *Pedantius*, and herein it becomes apparent, that the publisher or penner of these verses had a purpose in mind to attract the attention of the public to the proposed edition of *Pedantius* and make it popular, through a comparison with the already celebrated *Ignoramus*. The poem begins thus: "*Pedantius de se: scilicet haud solus dominabitur Ignoramus, etc.*"

2. WRITINGS IN CONDEMNATION OF IGNORAMUS.

We have already seen, that the performance of *Ignoramus* before the king, with its cutting satire upon the common lawyers, as a class, served to greatly nettle them. In order to avenge themselves therefore they and their friends betook themselves to the writing of several ballads and essays denouncing "*Ignoramus.*" Of these some are still extant. Among the essays of John Stephens, Jr., 2d edit., London, 1615, pp. 29-50, is a poem written expressly as a reproof to the author and actors of *Ignoramus*. The title is as follows: "*Essay the fourth entitled Reproofe. Or a defence of common Law and Lawyers mixt with reproofe against the Lawyer's common Enemy.*"

A poem is preserved in the Brit. Mus., Sloane MSS., No. 1775, with the title, "*To the comedians of Cambridge, who in three acts before the king abused the lawyers with an imposed Ignoramus, in two ridiculous persons, Ignoramus the master, and Dulman the clerk; John a Stile, student of the common law, wisheth a more sound judgment and more reverent opinion of their betters*" (Hawkins, edit. *Ignoramus*, p. 259, n. c.).

Another poem is preserved in the Brit. Mus. Harl. MSS., No. 5191, and is entitled, "*The Soldier's Counterbuff to the Cambridge Interludians of Ignoramus.*" (Hawkins' Edit. *Igno.*, p. lxiii, note a.)

Mr. Hawkins gives the title of still another poem as, "*A modest and temperate Reproof of the Scholars of Cambridge for slandering Lawyers with that barbarous and gross Title Ignoramus.*" (Edit. *Igno.*, p. lxiii, note a.)

We have also a book which bears the title, "*The Case and*

Argument against Sir Ignoramus of Cambridge, by Robert Callis, of Gray's Inn, Esquire, afterward Sergeant at Law, in his Reading at Staples Inn in Lent, 14 Ja. R., 4to. Lond. 1648."

It is also not improbable that Selden's "History of Tithes," printed in 1617, was composed in a spirit of retaliation for Ruggle's Ignoramus. Fuller, in his "Church History," Book X, p. 71, gives as his authority for such an opinion the author of Dr. Preston's life. Fuller however says in reference to it, he "cannot suspect so high a soul guilty of so low reflections that his book related at all to this occasion; but only that the latitude of his mind, tracing all paths of learning, did casually light on the road of this subject. (Hawkins' edit. Igno., p. lxxv, note b.) However the author of "A Discourse concerning Ridicule and Irony in Writing, in a Letter to the reverend Dr. Nathanael Marshall," printed in 8vo, Lond., 1729, refers, page 14, to the tradition of such retaliation as being current.

The success of the muses of Cambridge in their entertainment of the king seems to have incited rival muses at Oxford also to the composition of several poems derogatory to Cambridge and her entertainment. A poem, known as the Oxford ballad, was composed in Latin, presumably by Oxford students after the first performance of Ignoramus and sung in derision at the second presentation by the Cambridge scholars. This poem in the original seems to be no longer extant; but an English translation of it, accredited to bishop Corbet, is still preserved. (See Corbet's Poems, edit. 1628, p. 29.)¹ It consists of twenty-six six-line strophies and is entitled, "A grave Poem, as it was presented in Latin by certain Divines before his majesty in Cambridge, by way of Interlude, styled "Liber novus de Adventu Regis Cantabrigiam." Faithfully done into English, with some liberal advantage: made rather to be sung than read, to the tune of "Bonny Nell." The poem begins thus:

¹ Reprinted in Dryden's Miscellany, Vol. VI, p. 325; also in Hawkins edit. Ignoramus, p. cvii.

It is not yet a fortnight, since
 Lutetia entertain'd our prince,
 And vented hath a studied toy
 As long as was the siege of Troy,

There must have been also other poems composed by the Oxford scholars; for Mr. Chamberlain says, in a second letter, preserved in the Brit. Mus. among the Birch collection of MSS., dated 1615, March, while referring to the Oxford men, "They have offered at two or three bald ballads, which are such poor stuff they be not worth the looking after. But I hear they have it better in a 'Freshman's letter to his mother,' wherein he relates somewhat handsomely, all that passed."

3. TRANSLATION AND ADAPTATION.

In the year 1662 Ignoramus was translated into English by one who signed himself as R. C. These initials are interpreted to stand for Robert Codrington, an interpretation which is based upon the authority of Wood, who in his *Athenae Oxonienses*, Vol. II, p. 356, accredits Codrington, among a list of other works, with this translation. The title-page reads as follows: "Ignoramus, a Comedy, as it was several Times acted, with extraordinary Applause, before the Majesty of King James: with a Suppliment, which, out of Respect to the Students of the Common Law, was hitherto wanting. Written in Latin by R [G.] Ruggles, sometimes Master of Arts in Clare College in Cambridge; and translated into English by R. C., sometimes Master of Arts in Magdalen College in Oxford. Lond. 1662." Copies of this translation are preserved at Oxford and in the British Mus.

In 1678 appeared at London an adaptation of Ignoramus under the title of "The English Lawyer, a comedy acted at the Royal Theatre. Written by Edward Ravenscroft. Gent. London, 1678."

This adaptation passed through three editions. The title to the second edition is as follows: "Ignoramus or the English Lawyer, a comedy as it was acted in the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane. London, 1736."

The third edition is without date, but the Brit. Mus. Catalogue assigns the year 1737. This edition in the Brit. Mus. is bound together with five other works. The title-page reads as follows: "Ignoramus: or the English Lawyer, a Comedy as it is acted at the Theatre in Dublin. Written by Edward Ravenscroft. Gent. Dublin." Copies of these three editions are preserved in the Brit. Mus.

The Westminster editions of 1731 and 1737 have also some claim to the name of adaptations. The edition of 1731 contains new prologues used by the king's scholars of Westminster in their presentation of the drama in the years 1712 and 1713. The edition of 1737 contains those used at the same school in the years 1712, 1713 and 1730. These editions have also an additional fifth act which was prepared and used for the presentations at Westminster.

4. SCHIOPPIUS AND DOCTOR IGNORAMUS.

For lack of knowledge concerning the true title of a drama performed before King James in the year 1616, I have assigned to it a title as above. Of the causes which led to the composition of this drama and its presentation before the king, Charles Nisard in his work entitled "*Les Gladiateurs de la République des Lettres*," Vol. II, p. 102 f., gives the following interesting account. Speaking of Gaspar Schioppius and a satire, entitled, "*Legatus Latro*," written by him against King James and his friend Casaubon,¹ Nisard says: "*Casaubon était mort l'année précédente: mais Jacques était plein de vie, et en se vengeant soimême, il songea aussi à venger son ami. Bruler un livre était chose si commune qu'un auteur eût été bien délicat, qui eût cru pour cela être deshonoré. Pour flétrir Schioppius, il fallait un autre moyen, Jacques pensa l'avoir trouvé.*"

"Le 2 mai 1616, une pièce fut jouéé sur le théâtre de la

¹ Isaac Casaubon, the distinguished classical scholar, was born at Geneva, 1559, was at first a Calvinist and vehement opponent of Catholicism. In May, 1610, he went to England, became a close friend of King James I, and also an ardent adherent of the English Church and was therefore bitterly persecuted by the Puritans as well as by the Catholics. He died in England in 1614 and was buried in Westminster Abbey.

cour, en présence du roi de la Grande Bretagne, et de plusieurs Seigneurs allemands. Parmi eux, Schioppius nomme deux membres de la famille Fugger. Cette circonstance lui tenait au coeur, d'abord parce qu'il était Allemand, ensuite parce qu'il se croyait des droits à l'estime de la noblesse allemande, en raison de la faveur où il pensait être auprès des princes de ce pays. Jacques le savait bien; il avait donc choisi son auditoire en conséquence. Dans cette pièce un acteur représentait Schioppius. Le rôle des autres consistait à discuter avec lui et lui pousser des arguments ridicules. Schioppius se défendait par des citations tirées de l'Écriture, comme de flèches d'un carquois. Il venait d'en produire une mal à propos, quand un certain docteur Ignoramus, qui jouait dans la pièce le rôle de Momus, l'arrêta tout à coup en prononçant cet arrêt 'Que Schioppius serait étranglé jusqu'à ce que son âme sortît par son dernière.' Cet arrêt, dit Schioppius, plût tellement au prince, que Jacques en perdit presque le souvenir de sa majesté. Il se leva tout à coup, rit aux éclats, se frappa le genou en signe d'applaudissement, et se serra le ventre pour combattre la douleur que lui causait ce rire immodéré. Il parut enfin hors de son bon sens, et, pour tout dire, fou à lier." Nisard gives as his source: G. Scioppii Haereticus Elenchomenos, in praefatione, pp. 8 and 9.

According to this account, the plan of this drama was the same as that of the second prologue of the drama Ignoramus, in which the purpose was also to chastise Schioppius. How far this play was an imitation of Ignoramus we cannot say; but it is certain that the character Docteur Ignoramus as well as his speech, quoted above, which caused the king to laugh so heartily, were borrowed directly from Ruggle's drama. We may conjecture that the performance of the comedy Ignoramus suggested to the king both the plan, referred to above, of chastising his enemy Schioppius, and probably the man to compose the drama for this purpose.

5. BUTLER'S HUDIBRAS.—ITS RELATION TO IGNORAMUS AND OTHER SOURCES.

Sources for Hudibras Formerly Proposed.

Before endeavoring to demonstrate that the comedy Ignoramus exerted an influence upon the composition of Hudibras it will be expedient first to notice what has heretofore been said in reference to Butler's sources for his most celebrated poem.

The English scholar and author Dr. Samuel Johnson first pointed out that Butler had made use of Cervantes' Don Quixote. He says: "The poem of Hudibras is one of those compositions, of which a nation may justly boast, as the images which it exhibits are domestic; the sentiments unborrowed and unexpected, and the strain of diction original and peculiar. We must not however as the countrymen of Butler allow ourselves to make any encroachments upon justice nor appropriate those honors, which others have a right to share. The poem of Hudibras is not entirely English; the original idea is to be found in the history of Don Quixote—a book to which a mind of the greatest powers may be indebted without disgrace" (*Lives of the Poets*).

Again the French author, J. Voltaire, in a letter written in the year 1726, "Sur M. Pope et quelques autres Poètes fameux" speaking of Butler's poem says: "Le poeme d'Hudibras, dont je vous parle, semble être un composé de la Satyre Ménippée et de Don Quichotte, etc." (*Lettre XXII, Oeuvres Complètes*, edit. Paris, 1879, tom. 22, p. 170.)

The general tendency with historians of English literature in modern times has been to minimize Butler's indebtedness to Don Quixote, and of the influence from the Satyre Ménippée few take any cognizance whatever. Hettner, in his *Geschichte der Englischen Litteratur* 5. aufl., p. 68, says: "Man erweist dem Gedicht (Hudibras) einen sehr schlechten Dienst, wenn man es, wie wohl englische Kritiker selbstgefällig zu tun pflegen, mit dem Don Quixote zusammensetzt. Freilich hat der Dichter seinen Ritter und knappen den unsterblichen Vorbildern des edlen Junker's von La Mancha und seines getreuen Sancho Pansa entlehnt, aber für die feine ironische Kunst des

Cervantes hatte er kein Gefühl und keinen Verstand. Wo ist hier jener edle gemüthswärme Idealismus, der durch alle Tollheiten und Verkehrtheiten Don Quixote's so liebenswürdig hindurchschimmert und ihm immer und überall herzliche Theilnahme sichert? Sir Hudibras und Ralf sind vom Anfang bis zum Ende elende und gemeine Lumpe, auf die alle Thorheiten und Laster geladen sind, die nur jemals die Cavaliere den Rundköpfen schuld gaben."

Mr. Richard Garnett, one of the most recent of English historians says: "Butler's Hudibras may perhaps be best defined as a metrical parody upon Don Quixote, with a spice of allusion to the Faerie Queene, in which the nobility and pathos of the originals are designedly obliterated, and the humor exaggerated into farce, to suit the author's polemic purpose." . . . "The machinery is closely modelled upon Don Quixote." (Age of Dryden, Lond., 1901, p. 58.)

Mr. W. J. Courthope, on the other hand, would seem, like most of German historians, to deny to Hudibras in all essentials much influence from Don Quixote. (See History of English Poetry, Lond., 1903, Vol. III, p. 358.)

Ignoramus a Source for Hudibras.

It is apparent from these excerpts that they all are of the most general character and that there is among critics little definiteness or unanimity of opinion as to how much influence should be accredited to any of the sources yet named. I proceed therefore to present the claims of the comedy Ignoramus as a source from which Butler drew for the characterization and action of his poem. The popularity of Ignoramus and the probability that Butler studied at Cambridge make it almost certain that the comedy was well known to him. Naturally in two works so radically different in form, great verbal likeness is scarcely to be looked for. It is the spirit of the actors, and the motives prompting them rather than speeches which are to be compared; motives and characteristics which are little more than suggested in the drama of Rugglé are, as we should expect, in Butler's epic elaborated at great length and sometimes

even repeated. Notwithstanding verbal similarities are not altogether lacking.

General Characteristics Common to Ignoramus and Hudibras.

Before beginning a comparison of the characters and motives in the Hudibras with those in Ignoramus, I call attention to several general characteristics common to both pieces of literature. I pass by the observation that both poems seem to have been composed with a purpose to pleasing royalty, and remind the reader that I endeavored in a previous chapter to show that the comedy Ignoramus was not purely and simply a legal satire, but that it was in a measure also a religious satire. I now emphasize that the poem Hudibras is not only a religious satire, in which the same sects, namely the Puritan and Catholic or non-conformist, are ridiculed as they were made laughable in Ignoramus; but that it is also, again like Ruggle's drama, a legal satire. Whether the purpose of the author was to ridicule a state of anarchy under the commonwealth, or that of the times in general, does not here concern us; the fact remains that the poem is markedly also a legal satire. On every possible opportunity the author lets this characteristic appear. As evidence of his bitterness against the legal situation of the times, I refer to the following passages as well as the last canto of part III, which is almost entirely occupied with the ridicule of the lawyer Hiccius Doctius.

Hudibras, I, II, 1177:

So Justice, while she winks at crimes
Stumbles on innocence sometimes.

Hudibras, II, II, 325:

Is not th' High-Court of Justice sworn
To judge that law that serves their turn?
Make their own jealousies high treason,
An fix 'em whomsoe'er they please on?
Cannot the learned counsel there
Make laws in any shape appear?
Mould 'em as witches do their clay,
When they make pictures to destroy,
And vex 'em into any form
That fits their purpose to do harm?

Hudibras, II, II, 349 :

As when the sea breaks o'er its bounds,
And overflows the level grounds,
Those banks and dams, that, like a screen,
Did keep it out, now keep it in;
So when tyrannic usurpation
Invades the freedom of a nation
The laws o' th' land, that were intended
To keep it out, are made defend it.
Does not in chanc'ry ev'ry man swear
What makes best for him in his answer?
Is not the winding up of witnesses
And nicking more than half the bus'ness?
For witnesses, like watches, go
Just as they're set, too fast or slow;
And where in conscience they're strait lac'd,
'Tis ten to one that side is cast.
Do not your juries give their verdict
As though they felt the cause not heard it?
And as they please make matter o' fact
Run all on one side, as they're packt?

Hudibras, II, III, 15 :

Others believe no voice t'an organ
So sweet as a lawyers in his bar-goun,
Until with subtile cobweb-cheats
Th' are catch'd in knotted law, like nets;
In which when once they are imbrangled,
The more they stir, the more they're tangled;
And while their purses can dispute,
There's no end of the immortal suit.

Hudibras, II, III, 619 :

Others with characters and words
Catch 'em, as men in nests do birds;

Hudibras, II, III, 957 :

There's but the twinkling of a star
Between a man of peace and war;
A thief and justice, fool and knave,
A huffing officer and a slave;
A crafty lawyer and a pick-pocket,
A great philosopher and a blockhead;
A formal preacher and a player,
A learn'd physician and manslayer.

Hudibras, III, I, 46 :

He held th' achievement was too glorious
 For such a conqueror to meddle
 With petty constable or beadle;
 Or fly for refuge to the Hostess
 Of the Inns of Court and Chancery, Justice;
 Who might, perhaps, reduce his cause.
 To th' ordeal trial of the laws
 Where none escape, but such as branded
 With red-hot irons have passed bare-handed;

Hudibras, III, I, 609 :

Such hideous sots were those obedient
 Old vassals to their ladies regent,
 To give the cheats the eldest hand
 In foul play by the laws o' th' land;

Compare also Hudibras II, II, 197-200; 281-2; 612-14: III, I, 1449-56: also III, III.

It might also be here observed, under general characteristics, that there seems to have been a desire on the part of Butler to write his poem in the macaronic form as Ruggle did his Ignoramus; but this feature will appear under a comparison of the characters themselves, therefore I make no further reference to it here.

COMPARISON OF CHARACTERS AND INCIDENTS.

The characters in both pieces of literature may be divided into two classes, namely the ridiculed party, and the opposing or ridiculing party. Ignoramus and Hudibras are both legal characters, who go with their clerks or attendants into disgraceful company and are involved in absurd adventures. They are defeated by practically the same number of men and women, who are united at best in thwarting all the movements of these two mock-heroes. These two parties strive often among themselves and always against each other. This feature of strife between the two opposing parties in Ignoramus, and the strife at times within those parties is likely that which caused Butler to see in it a type of the warfare between and within the political and religious parties of his time, and therefore a suitable plot for his satire.

*Ignoramus, the Lawyer—Hudibras, the Knight.*¹

1. We first observe that Hudibras is, not only like Don Quixote, a knight, but is also like Ignoramus, a legal character. That he exercised legal functions, the following passages will serve as illustration.

Hudibras, I, 1, 23:

Great on the bench, great in the saddle,
That could as well bind o'er as swaddle;

Hudibras, I, 1, 713:

And therefore thus bespoke the Squire
We that are wisely mounted higher

¹The portrait of Hudibras, the Knight, is a composite, in which the characteristics of more than one personage are discernable. Dr. Johnson is right, when he says "the author seems to labour with a tumultuous confusion of dissimilar ideas" ("Lives of the Poets"). The name of this so-called Knight is found in Spencer's *Faerie Queene*, Bk. II, canto II, 17. It was without doubt Cervantes' picture of Don Quixote, with his horse Rozinante and his ignorant Sancho Panza, which Butler chose first of all as a model for his portrait of Hudibras and Ralpho; when once Butler has sketched a mere outline, he looked away from that copy and began to fill in with features derived from various sources; so that in the completed composite picture of Hudibras all the manly features of Don Quixote had been obliterated. Don Quixote was, according to his conception of Knight-errantry, a true Knight; Hudibras is in reality no Knight; he is a sectarian religionist, a justice of the peace, a rogue. For the figure of Hudibras in the character of rogue Butler evidently drew from Shakespeare's portrait of Sir John Falstaff, as he appears in *Henry IV* and "*The Merry Wives of Windsor*." Falstaff is the prototype for Hudibras in vastness of body, in cowardliness and lasciviousness.

The *Satyre Menippée* has also a character not unlike Hudibras in the person of Monsieur C. Lieutenant (see *Sat. Men.*, Edit. Ratisbone, 1714, p. 181).

Nearly all historians of English literature recognize as a fact the tradition, that Butler drew his picture of Hudibras from the person and character of Sir Samuel Luke, in whose house Butler is believed to have lived for a time. This tradition first found expression in print fifty years after the appearance of Hudibras, in a key to the poem, attributed to Sir Roger L'Estrange, which was printed with Butler's posthumous works 1715. I shall not controvert this tradition; it may be noted however that if it is true, Butler has intentionally perverted several facts; first by making "The great spirited little Sir Samuel Luke" (see *Dict. Nat. Biog.*) into a cowardly Giant; secondly by placing the scene of the poem in the Westland, Butler's native section, while the home of Luke was in Bedfordshire towards the East. (See Hudibras, I, 1, 665.)

Than constables in curule wit,
When on tribunal bench we sit.

Hudibras, I, II, 1075:

Wherefore I think it better far
To keep him prisoner of war,
And let him fast in bonds abide,
At court of Justice to be try'd;
Where if he appear so bold and crafty,
There may be danger in his safety.
If any member there dislike
His face, or to his beard have pique;
Or if his death will save or yield
Revenge or fright, it is reveal'd,
Though he has quarter ne'er the less
Y' have power to hang him when you please.

Hudibras, I, II, 757:

Shall save or help thee to evade
The hand of Justice, or this blade,
Which I, her sword-bearer, do carry,
For civil deed and military.

Hudibras, II, III, 1021:

They're guilty, by their own confessions,
Of felony; and at the sessions,
Upon the bench I will so handle 'em,

2. To ridicule the vulgar dialect of mixed and corrupted languages was certainly the most apparent purpose in the character Ignoramus. Hudibras is described also as using the same manner of speech.¹

Ignoramus Prologue:

Quidni ego, qui omnes linguas calleam, 'Ελληνικὴν Latinam, Frangoise, Castellana, Italiana, Teuch, Polaski.

Hudibras:

Beside 'tis known he could speak Greek
As naturally as pigs squeak:
That Latin was no more difficile,
Than to a black-bird 'tis to whistle, etc.

¹ There are slight references to a jargon of languages in Don Quixote (see chaps. 8, 9, 11, 25, 32); also in Satyre Menippée (see Edit. Ratisbone, 1714, pp. 75 and 271). But in neither of these works is this a prominent characteristic of an individual as it is in Ignoramus and Hudibras.

Ignoramus, Sc. II, 6:

Quod multa dicit et nihil, quod jocosa serio, servia joco; quod Anglice Saxonice, Gallice et Latine loquitur, neque tamen Anglice, neque Saxonice, neque Gallice, neque Latine loquitur;

Hudibras, I, 1, 91:

But when he pleased to show it, his speech
In loftiness of sound was rich;
A Babylonish dialect,
Which learned pedants much affect.
It was a party-colour'd dress
Of patch'd and pye-ball'd languages:
'Twas English cut on Greek and Latin
Like fustian here-to-fore on satin.
It had an odd promiscuous tone,
As if h' talk'd three parts in one;
Which made some think, when he did gabble,
Th' had heard three labourers of Babel;
Or Cerberus himself pronounce
A leach of languages at once.
This he as volubly would vent
As if his stock wou'd ne'er be spent;
And truly to support that charge,
He had supplies as vast and large:
For he cou'd coin or counterfeit
New words so debas'd and hard, no stone
Was hard enough to touch them on;
And when with hasty noise he spoke 'em
The ignorant for current took 'em;

Butler, moreover, frequently caused Hudibras to interlard his speeches with Latin, which leads us to conjecture that, had Butler had more skill in the use of Latin, he would have caused Hudibras to use more largely that dialect, which has been described in the foregoing passages as being so characteristic of him; just as Ruggle did with his character Ignoramus.

3. It is apparent not only through their dialect, just referred to, that both Ignoramus and Hudibras are pedants; but it appears also in nearly every sentence they utter. Notwithstanding this, both are despisers of academic learning. I present the following passages for comparison.¹

¹ Don Quixote was scarcely a pedant, certainly no despiser of academical learning. Satyre Menippée furnishes some ridicule of pedantry, but not of a nature, we think, to have influenced Hudibras directly (cf. *Sat. Men.*, Edit. Ratisbone, 1714, pp. 62, 76, 155, 207).

Ignoramus, Sc. I, 3:

Igno. Sunt magni idiotae, et clerici nihilorum, isti Universitantes: miror quomodo spendisti tuum tempus inter eos.

Mus. Ut plurimum versatus sum in Logica.

Ignor. Logica? Quae villa, quod burgum est Logica?

Mus. Est una artium liberalium.

Igno. Liberalium? Sic putabam. In nomine Dei, Stude artes parcas
et lucrosas: non est Mundus pro artibus liberalibus jam.

Hudibras, I, III, 1337:

Quoth Ralpho, Nothing but th' abuse
Of human learning you produce;
Learning that cobweb of the brain,
Profane, erroneous and vain
A trade of knowledge, as replete
As others are with fraud and cheat;
An art t' incumber gifts and wit,
And render both for nothing fit;

Ignoramus, Prologue, II:

P. Ver. Num ergo pronuntiare potest Ignoramus?
Dul. Non pronuntiat, sed pronuntiat tamen;

Hudibras, I, i, 91:

But, when he pleas'd to shew't it, his speech
In loftiness of sound, was rich;
A Babylonish dialect,
Which learned pedants much affect.

Ignoramus, Sc. II, 6:

quid illud est, quod jure vivit et injuria;
. quod finitum facit
infinitum; verum non verum, non verum verum facit.

Hudibras, II, II, 5:

That keep their consciences in cases,
As fiddlers do their crowds and bases,
Ne'er to be us'd but when they're bent
To play a fit for argument;
Make true and false, unjust and just,
Of no use but to be discust;

Ignoramus, Sc. II, 6:

Scientiae, nisi Ignoramus, hostis nemo est.

Hudibras, II, III, 797:

Art has no mortal enemies,
Next ignorance, but owls and geese.

4. We see Ignoramus upon the stage both acting and being made a fool. The picture of Hudibras is the same. Moreover the same epithets applied to Ignoramus are also applied to Hudibras in the following passages:¹

Hudibras, I, I, 29:

But here our author makes a doubt,
Whether he were more wise or stout.
Some hold the one and some the other;
But howsoe'er they make a pother,
The difference was so small, his brain
Outweigh'd his rage but half a grain;
Which made some take him for a tool,
That knaves do work with call'd a fool.
For 't has been held by many, that
As Montaigne, playing with his cat,
Complains she thought him but an ass,
Much more she wou'd Sir Hudibras;

Hudibras, I, III, 247:

Whom furious Orsin thus bespoke:
Shall we (quoth he) thus basely brook
The vile affront that paltry ass,
And feeble scoundrel, Hudibras;

5. Both Ignoramus and Hudibras make oaths, which they do not hesitate to violate or evade, to help themselves out of trouble.² This motive is enlarged upon by Butler so that it forms the subject of discussion to the long dialogue between Hudibras and Ralpho in the first half of canto II, II.

¹ We have already observed (p. 76) that Shakespeare's figure of Falstaff was the prototype of Butler's corpulent fool. At the follies of Don Quixote we are forced to smile; but he is no such fool as Ignoramus, Falstaff and Hudibras. Cervantes made his hero the unfortunate victim of by-gone ideals and a diseased imagination; we are compelled also to cherish for that victim a friendly sympathy, even admiration. It is quite otherwise with Hudibras.

² Don Quixote unlike Ignoramus and Hudibras never violates his oath. He is in all respects the personification of honor and virtue. Such an act would have been in keeping with the character of Falstaff.

Ignoramus, Sc. II, 8:

Igno. Per Deos, si unquam posthac, tollite Hispanicos companiones.

Trico. Quin tu fugis jam?

Cup. Sequere, sequere; quo fugit?

Igno. Sum salvus, et sanus nunc; titillabo vos; monstrabo triccum de lege. Quoniam juravi, non ibo ipse, sed mittam clericum meum Dulman pro Rosabella.

Hudibras, II, II, 55:

Whether it be direct infringing
An oath, if I should wave this swingeing,
And what I've sworn to bear, forbear,
And so by equivocation swear,
Or whether it be lesser sin
To be forsworn than act the thing.

Hudibras, III, I, 505:

Why then (quoth he) may Hell surprise—
That trick (said she) will not pass twice;
I've learn'd how far I'm to believe
Your pinning oaths upon your sleeve.

Compare further Hudibras, II, II, 269 ff.; also III, I, 405 ff.

6. Ignoramus and Hudibras are both sensual, selfish and false lovers who purpose to marry only for money. In the comedy Ignoramus this lust for money is apparent also in the character Theodorus. The above-named characteristics are made very prominent in the Hudibras.¹

Ignoramus, Sc. I, 5:

Rosabella was supposed to be poor, therefore Ignoramus says: "nam cum venio in Angliam, maritabo mihi divitem uxorem; et tum tenebo hanc in commendam tantum pro transi-tempus."

Hudibras, II, I, 439:

Quoth she, I grant you may be close
In hiding what your aims propose.
Love-passions are like parables,
By which men still mean something else.

¹ In lasciviousness Hudibras corresponds well with Falstaff: But Falstaff never thought on marriage as Ignoramus and Hudibras do. Neither did Falstaff calculate how much money a woman had. It is merely sensual gratification on which he thinks. Don Quixote, like Ignoramus and Hudibras is an ardent lover, is also like them disappointed and baffled: but unlike them, he is no sensual, selfish false lover, his love is an idealized one, it is pure, generous, constant.

Though love be all the world's pretence,
 Money's the mythologic sense;
 The real substance of the shadow,
 Which all address and courtship's made to.

Compare further Ignoramus, Sc. I, 1, and Hudibras, II, III, 515 ff., also III, I, 523–1288.

7. Ignoramus and Hudibras both endeavor to please the women they pretend to love with laughable promises and poetic effusions clad in legal phrase.

Compare, in particular, Ignoramus, sc. I, 5, and Hudibras, II, II, 677–686, also Ignoramus, scs. IV, 9, 10, and Hudibras, II, I, 283 ff., also III, I, 163 ff.¹

8. The characters Ignoramus and Hudibras correspond in that in the action of the respective works, all the movements and plans of these heroes are baffled in practically the same manner and both receive the same manner of treatment at the hands of their enemies.

(a) The gelders horn is employed as an instrument of terror to both Ignoramus and Hudibras.²

Ignoramus, Sc. II, 7:

Qui, me audiente, castrare Ignoramum
 Velle se, si deprehenderit.

Ignoramus, Sc. II, 8:

Conduxi qui castraret, statim aderit
 (Cupes intro cornu sonat, ut castrator)
 Trin—Tran; Trin—Tran; Trin—Tran.

Quin tu fugis jam?
 Sequere, sequere; quo fugit?

Ignoramus, Sc. III, 13:

¹ The device of the letters and effusive promises addressed by Hudibras to the widow may well be compared with the letter and soliloquies of Don Quixote addressed to the lady Dulcinea; but the tone of infidelity and the legal phraseology in Hudibras's love effusions is rather that of Ignoramus than Don Quixote. Falstaff also sent Mrs. Page such a letter, but it is without legal phraseology.

² A horn is used several times in Don Quixote, apparently as a signal of alarm, but there is no intimation of a gelders horn (Cf. "Don Quixote," chaps. 2, 41, 70).

Trin—Tran; Trin—Tran.

At Lucanus ait, cornus tibi cura sinistri.

Hudibras, II, II, 585:

And now the cause of all their fear
By slow degrees approached so near,
They might distinguish different noise
Of horns and pans and dogs and boys.

II, II, 609:

First he that led the cavalcate
Wore a sow-gelders flagellate,
On which he blew as strong a levet
As well-fee'd lawyer on his breviae,
When over one another's heads
They charge (three ranks at once) like Swedes.

Compare also Hudibras, I, II, 537, and II, I, 687-723.

(b) Both Ignoramus and Hudibras, together with their attendants, are intercepted by their enemies, and placed in confinement. In Ignoramus, Pecus, the clerk, is sent to claim Rosabella and is imprisoned, Act IV, sc. 8: later Ignoramus himself is sent to the cloister, there to be confined, Act IV, sc. 11. In Hudibras both the knight and his squire are confined together and at the same time Part I, canto III, l. 1000 ff.¹

(c) Both Ignoramus and Hudibras are reported or imputed to be possessed of demonical spirits, compare Ignoramus, sc. III, 8; scs. IV, 5 and 9, with Hudibras, II, I, 123 ff.²

(d) Both Ignoramus and Hudibras are subjected by their enemies to the torments of exorcism. In Ignoramus the chastisement is inflicted by the monk and his companions, scs. IV, 10 and 11: In Hudibras it is accomplished by Sidrophel, the astrologer and his emissaries. Part III, conto I, 1053-1606.³

¹Don Quixote was also imprisoned by the priest and barber (chap. 5). Again by the monks, dressed as goblins (chap. 37). In *Satyre Menippée* the Advocate general was imprisoned in a cloister (see *Sat. Men.*, Edit. Ratisbone, 1714, pp. 129 and 189 ff). In "Merry Wives of Windsor" Falstaff was stuffed into a clothes-hamper. Imprisonment would be a motive too common to notice were it not in connection with a large number of correspondences between Ignoramus and Hudibras.

²The idea that Don Quixote was possessed and mad is in the romance everywhere implied.

³Don Quixote was also treated by monks disguised as goblins (see Chaps. 37 and 38). Falstaff is also pinched and burned by faeries and elves in

While we assign Ignoramus as Butler's source for this motive, it is necessary that we acknowledge at the same time another source from which Butler drew. Particularly at this point, Butler blended with the plot of Ignoramus, that of a drama attributed to Mr. Tompkis, entitled *Albumazar*,¹ the Astrologer, which like Ignoramus was founded on a comedy of Giam Battista Porta, namely *L'Astrologo*, and which, furthermore, formed a part of the entertainment provided for King James the First, during his first visit to Cambridge, being performed before him the next evening following the first presentation of Ignoramus.

Whereas Ignoramus, in company with Torcol and Dulman, goes, at the end of Sc. IV, 8, to the house of Theodorus in order to make inquiries in reference to Rosabella, and while there he is attacked by the monk and his allies, Hudibras, on the other hand, goes, Part II, canto III, to Sidrophel, the Astrologer, in order to learn of him his destinies in love, and while there, he quarrels with, vanquishes and robs the astrologer.

In *Albumazar* Pandolfol is in love with Flavia, and goes to the astrologer, *Albumazar*, in order to interest him in his behalf. He finally quarrels with him, and while pretending to be robbed, he deprives the astrologer of jewels which he had promised to give him in exchange for his services. Thus far the history of Hudibras, as contained in part II, canto III, corresponds very well with the plot of *Albumazar*; but at this point Butler returns to the experiences of Ignoramus. In part III, canto I, while Hudibras is at the home of his lady relating to her of his victory and his obedience to her commands, he is surprised by a company of furies and hobgoblins, who chastise the false hero in a manner entirely similar to that in which Ignoramus was handled by the monk. There is nothing in the history of Pandolfol, which corresponds to the chastisement and cross-examination, which Hudibras suffers in part III, canto I,

Merry Wives of Windsor (Sc. V, 5); however questioning as to sins, etc., has no place in the treatment of Don Quixote and Falstaff as it has in the torture inflicted upon Ignoramus and Hudibras.

¹ See Dodsley-Hazlitt's "Old English Plays," Vol. XI.

of Butler's poem, or which Ignoramus suffers in Sc. IV, 5, of Ruggle's drama.

9. Ignoramus and Hudibras both, when defeated and persecuted, propose to seek justice through the law. Compare Ignoramus, Scs. IV, 8 and 9; and Hudibras, III, III, l. 373—to end of canto.

Dulman, Musaeus, Pecus—Ralpho.

Attendants respectively to Ignoramus and Hudibras.

1. Dulman, the clerk of Ignoramus, and Ralpho, the squire attendant upon Hudibras, are both caricatured as "dull men," and treated by their masters as such.

Ignoramus, Sc. IV, 7:¹

Es magnus vitulus vocatus a great calf.—Dixit? etiam talis lobba, Dulman? Dulman revera.—Hanga, hanga; putabam quod Musaeus erat major asinus quam tu; sed tu es major asinus quam unus universitans.

Hudibras, I, I, 479:

His knowledge was not far behind
The Knight's, but of another kind,
And he another way came by 't:
Some call it gifts and some New-light;
A liberal art that cost no pains
Of study, industry, or brains
His wit was sent him for a token,
But in the carriage crack'd and broken.

2. Dulman and Ralpho are both, in a sense, faithful to their respective masters and defend them against assaults of their enemies. Compare Ignoramus, Scs. I, 3; IV, 11, and V, 10. Hudibras, *e. g.*, I, II, ll. 825 ff. and 945 ff.

3. Dulman and Ralpho, however, both quarrel with their respective masters. Compare Ignoramus, Sc. IV, 7. Hudibras, II, II, in particular ll. 541–584.

4. Musaeus, another clerk of Ignoramus, and Ralpho, the squire, both complain of the treatment or consideration, which they receive at the hands of their respective masters, ridicule their views, and betray them into the hands of their enemies, by informing the same of their approach in order to claim the

¹ Sancho Panza of Don Quixote was probably, either directly or indirectly a prototype for both Dulman of Ignoramus and Ralpho of Hudibras.

ladies they profess to love. Compare Ignoramus, Sc. II, 6. Hudibras, II, II, 500-540, and III, I, 129-156.

5. The views of both Musaeus and Ralpho are despised by their respective masters. Compare Ignoramus, Sc. I, 3. Hudibras, *e. g.*, I, III, 1073 ff.

6. Pecus, still another clerk of Ignoramus, and Ralpho, the squire, are both imprisoned. Compare Ignoramus, Sc. IV, 8; and Hudibras, I, III, 1000 ff.

Opposing Characters.

Although Ignoramus was defeated largely through the cunning of Trico, and clearly defined acts of other individuals opposing him, while Hudibras, on the other hand, was opposed largely by a mob, wherein the character and acts of the individual are more obscure; nevertheless the party opposing Hudibras consists of practically the same number of active opponents as that opposing Ignoramus; and corresponding individuals with corresponding characteristics are discernible among the opponents of these two mock-heroes.

Rosabella—The Widow.

Rosabella of the comedy Ignoramus and the widow of the Hudibras have a correspondence in this, that they are both, as we have already noted, the victims of practically the same unworthy purposes on the part of Ignoramus and Hudibras respectively. They correspond further herein, that they both have a lively aversion for their pretentious suitors, that they both laugh at their poetic effusions, and that they are both freed from these false suitors by certain individuals who at least help them to undo the same. They are unlike in this; that, while Rosabella is more passive, almost silent, and trusts the management of her cause almost entirely to her true lover and his allies; the widow on the other hand stands more alone, and takes therefore herself a more active part in defeating the knight and in rendering him ridiculous. Accordingly, whereas the discontented clerk of Ignoramus betrays the plans of his master to Trico, the representative of Rosabella; the squire of

Hudibras, when he purposes to betray the falsity of his master, divulges it directly to the widow.

Polla—Trulla.

Polla, of the comedy Ignoramus, and Trulla, of the poem Hudibras, have correspondence in the following common characteristics:

(a) Both women are described as stout viragos, who, in consideration of part of the booty, consent to assist their husbands in inflicting punishment upon Ignoramus and Hudibras respectively.

Ignoramus, Sc. II, 3:

Cup. Vel maxime. Allicere autem ut possim, vereor;

Morosa adeo, jurgat semper, etiam, Trico me verberat.

Tri. Num furia?

Cup. Imo, Trico. Vel una omnes furiae.

Tri. Octo ecce aureos.

Cup. Da mihi, et ducam Danaem.

Ignoramus, Sc. II, 4:

Polla. Mihi des aurum;

Effectum reddam optime, mi Cupes.

Cup. En duos aureos:

Postquam effeceris, alteros tantos dederō.

Polla. Convenit. . . .

Hudibras, I, II, 365:

He Trulla loved; Trulla, more bright
Than burnish'd armour of her Knight:
A bold virago, stout and tall
As Joan of France, or English Mall.
Thro' perils both of wind and limb,
Thro' thick and thin, she follow'd him,
In every adventure h' undertook,
And never him or it forsook:
At breach of wall, or hedge surprise,
She shared i' th' hazard and the prize:
At beating quarters up, or forage
Behav'd herself with matchless courage;
And laid about fight more busily
Than the Amazonian dame Penthesile.

(b) For the lascivious character of the two women, compare Ignoramus, Sc. V, 11, and Hudibras, I, II, 379-408, also II, II, 640-752.

(c) Both these Amazonian women quarrel with and chastise respectively Ignoramus and Hudibras.

Ignoramus, Sc. III, 8:

Pol. Mane, sandalia dum exuam mihi.

Ign. Ego te scalpam pro sorciera ut es.

Pol. Minare? discobinabo ego te. Itane, longurio, etiam ausus irritare me?

Ign. Oh ho! vi et armis et manu forti? oh moderata misericordia; saltem licentia surgenti.

Pol. Ornabo te ut dignus es, venefice.

Ign. O, supersereas de non molestando; custodi pacem, custodi pacem, custodi pacem.

Pol. Sumne Rosabella jam?

Ign. Et quid vis. Profecto ego sum valide mahemiatus. Habeo appellum de plagis et mahemio.

Pol. Abin', daemoniace, annon?

Ign. Abeo; sum valide brusatus. Ibo ad Mansorium, et dicam orationes meas:

Sed tu dabis Glutwit, sorceria.

Pol. Cornicaris, larvate? medius fidius opinor hunc hominem esse demoniacum: verba certe magica loquitur.

Hudibras, I, III, 769-770:

When Trulla, whom he did not mind
Charged him like lightning behind.

I, III, 780:

When Hudibras his hard fate drew
To succor him; for as he bow'd
To help him up, she laid a load
Of blows so heavy, and plac'd so well
On t'other side, that down he fell
Yield, scoundrel base, (quoth she) or die:
Thy life is mine, and liberty.

I, III, 814:

I scorn (quoth she) thou coxcomb silly.

I, III, 823:

This said she to her tackle fell,
And on the Knight let fall a peal
Of blows so fierce, and press'd so home,
That he retir'd and follow'd 's bum.
Stand to 't (quoth she) or yield to merey;
It is not fighting arsie-versie

Shall serve thy turn. This stirr'd his spleen
 More than the danger he was in,
 The blows he felt, or was to feel,
 Although they already made him reel.

(*d*) Polla and Trulla are respectively the direct or indirect means of bringing Ignoramus and Hudibras into an enchanted castle.

Ignoramus, Sc. III, 8, at end:

Nunc domum ibo, et vicinis haec narrabo, ut caveant ab illo daemoniaco.

Ignoramus, Sc. IV, 10:

Pol. Boni fratres, hic est ille daemoniacus; hic alter illius socius, etc.

Hudibras, I, III, 949:

Him she resolv'd that Hudibras
 Should ransom, and supply his place.

Hudibras, I, III, 972:

They put themselves upon the way,
 Striving to reach the enchanted castle,
 Where stout Crowdero in durance lay still.

Hudibras, I, III, 1000:

But Trulla straight brought on the charge,
 And in the self same limbo put
 The Knight and squire where he was shut;

Polla—Fama; the Widow.

Whereas Polla went about the neighborhood and circulated the report that Ignoramus was a demoniac, Butler, who at this point evidently strives to rival Vergil's description of Fama, causes this goddess to circulate the report of all that has happened to Hudibras, all of which the widow hears, comes near his cell and imagines that she sees one possessed.

Ignoramus, Sc. III, 8:

Pol. Cornicaris larvule? medius fidius opinor hunc hominem esse daemoniacum: verba certe magica loquitur. Nunc domum ibo, et vicinis haec narrabo ut caveant ab illo daemoniaco. (*Ign.*, Sc. IV, 9.) *Ant.* See, this is the possessed man you heard of. (*Ign.*, Sc. IV, 10.) *Pol.* Boni fratres hic est ille daemoniacus, hic alter illius socius.

Hudibras, II, I, 123:

This place (quoth she) they say 's enchanted,
 And with delinquent spirits haunted,
 That here are ty'd in chains, and scourg'd
 Until their guilty crimes be purg'd:
 Look, there are two of them appear,
 Like persons I have seen somewhere, etc., etc.

In Ignoramus Polla appears, on still another occasion, in her virago-character. In Sc. III, 10, she attacks at the inn her husband and his companions and cudgels them to the music they are enjoying, with which scene may be compared the second attack upon Hudibras, II, II, 641 ff.; wherein verse 720 "Be claw'd and cudgel'd to some tune" is especially suggestive of influence from the above scene of Ignoramus.

Trico—Talgol.

As Trico was the leader of intrigues against Ignoramus, so Talgol seems to be the leader of the mob against Hudibras (see Hudibras, I, II, 683 ff.), and again like Trico is described as a trickster.

Ignoramus, I, 7:

Tor. Annulum!

O Triconis tricas! ego te—

Tor. Cavebo dehinc de tricis tuis, Trico.

Hudibras, I, II, 747:

Nor all thy tricks and slights to cheat

.

Hudibras, I, II, 757.

Shall save thee or help thee to evade

The hand of Justice or this blade.

Cola—Colon.

Both these men are religious or rather irreligious characters. Compare the gluttonous, wine-bibbing monk as described in the drama, Ignoramus scenes IV, 6, 10, and V, 11, with the following description of Colon, from the poem Hudibras, I, II, 465:

It was a question whether he
 Or 's horse were of a family
 More worshipful; 'till antiquaries
 (After th' had almost por'd out their eyes)
 Did very learnedly decide
 The business on the horse's side,
 And prov'd not only horse, but cows,
 Nay, pigs, were of the elder house;
 For beasts, when man was but a piece
 Of earth himself, did th' earth possess.

Fidicen—Crowdero.

The fidicen of Ignoramus and Crowdero the fiddler, of Hudibras are both attacked and worsted in the fray. Compare Ignoramus, Sc. III, 10; and Hudibras, I, II, 911–1178, also I, II, 667–676.

Vince—Orsin.

These two characters have correspondence herein, that they both throw stones at Dulman, the clerk of Ignoramus, and Ralpho, the squire of Hudibras, respectively.

Ignoramus, Sc. V, 10:

Dul. Si ego capio te—

Vince. Come, come, and you dare I have stones here i' faith.

Dul. Will you? will you throw stones?

Vince. I, that I will.

Dul. O my shins!

Vince. It was well hit: now I'll away.

Hudibras, I, III, 491:

When Orsin first let fly a stone

At Ralpho:

I, III, 499:

The danger startled the bold squire,

And made him some few steps retire;

Compare also Hudibras, I, III, 519 ff. and II, II, 815 ff.

Other Incidents common to Ignoramus and Hudibras.

The horse of Hudibras, and in part, Hudibras himself bears a striking resemblance to the hobby-horse, or Davus Dromo, in the first prologue of Ignoramus.¹

Comparing the following points of similarity between these two horses, with our comparison of the hobby-horse in Ignoramus and the horse of

(a) Both horses are spoken of as runaways.

Ignoramus, Prologue I:

Num quis Musarum Caballum vidit hic?

Oyez,—oyez,—oyez; Musarum Caballus aberravit modo, nomine Davus
Dromo,

Ergo velim hunc Davum Dromonem in pistrinum dari.

Hudibras, II, I, 699:

Or should I take you for a stray,
You must be kept a year and day
(Ere I can own you) here i' th' pound,
Where, if y' are sought, you may be found.

(b) Both are monsters, half horse, half man,²

Ignoramus, Prologue I:

Qui semihomo et totus caballus est,

Homo fuit; sed cum homo non magis saperet quam caballus, iratae Musae,
quas vexabat indies, mutarunt eum in caballinum hominem.

Hudibras, III, I, 1339:

Unhappy wretch!
What hast thou gotten by this fetch,
Or all thy tricks, in this new trade,
Thy holy brotherhood o' th' blade?
By saunt'ring still on some adventure,
And growing to they horse a Centaur?

(c) Descriptions of the Horses.

Ignoramus, Prologue I:

biceps bestia, vegrandi capite, et
recalvastro, perlongis auribus, ru-
bicundo rostro, quasi ore patulo,
labris prominentibus,—

juba curta et subrufa,—

excoriato dorso,—

Hudibras, I, I, 423:

The beast was sturdy, large and tall,
with mouth of meal, and eyes of wall.
I wou'd say eye; for h' had but one,
As most agree; tho' some say none.

Hudibras, II, I:

A sorrel mane?

Hudibras I, I, 445:

His strutting ribs on both sides
show'd

Don Quixote (see above, p. 25, f.), it becomes apparent, we believe, that Butler was little indebted to Cervantes for his picture of the horse; and that he was influenced here primarily by Ignoramus.

² Hudibras is, *metaphorically*, called a Centaur for being so inseparably attached to his horse. Dromo, in the hobby-horse, is made a monster because of the anger of the Muses.

	Like furrows he himself had plow'd;
	Hudibras, I, I, 434:
pedibus anterioribus ulcerosis,	Had corns upon his feet and toes,
Ignoramus Prologue, I.	Hudibras, I, I, 449:
at caudam pulchellam habet . . .	His draggling tail hung in the dirt,
Cauda est pulchra satis, hac	Which on his rider he did flirt.
muscas a Musis abigo.	

(d) Both steeds are fleet.

Ignoramus, Prologue I:

At erat Incitatus nobilis et velox equus; tu segnipes caballus.

Egon'? qui tot regiones, plerasque etiam sine viatico, pererravi saepius.

Quin cursu provoco omnes nobilium hic praesentium equos celeripedes, sive Puppy, sive Franklin, sive Peppercorn, sive Crop-ear, . . . et nisi tintinnabulum vindicem ego, caudam curtate mihi:

Hudibras, I, I, 427:

He was well stay'd; and in his gait,
Preserv'd a grave majestic state.
At spur or switch no more he skipt,
Or mended pace, than Spaniard whipt;
And yet so fiery, he wou'd bound
As if he griev'd to touch the ground:

(e) Both steeds are ferocious kickers.

Ignoramus, Prologue I:

Cur. Oh, ferox calcitro!

Equ. Compellamus illum altrinsecus in istum angulum: blande puer; poppysmate palpemus eum.

Ambo. Ho, ho, ho, ho, ho, ho Messe, ho Dave, ho,

Messe Dave, ho Dromo, ho Messe Dave

Dromo, ho, Messe Dave, ho Dromo ho.

Equ. Ah nequissima bestia, vin' aufugere? non tu Davus Dromo jam, sed dromedarius.

Hudibras, I, II, 845:

The angry beast did straight resent
The wrong done to his fundament;
Began to kick, and fling, and wince,
As if h' had been beside his sense,
Striving to disengage from thistle,
That gall'd him sorely under his tail:
Instead of which, he threw the pack
Of Squire and baggage from his back;
And blund'ring still with smarting rump,
He gave the Knight's steed such a thump
As made him reel.

(f) Both horses are for sale.

Ignoramus, Prologue I:

Numquis jam emet ridiculum hunc caballum? Cabal. Sine ut inspectem,

Hudibras, II, 1:

Can I bring proof

Where, when, by whom, and what y' were sold for,
And in the open market toll'd for?

The peculiar incident of pulling or tweaking noses is common to the drama Ignoramus and the poem Hudibras.

Ignoramus, Sc, I, 4:

Dabit tibi hoc privatum signum, capiet te per nasum sic. Igno. Sc. III, 2. Dicis bene. Ne sit breve erroris, injunctum est mihi vellere te per nasum. Igno. Sc. III, 6. Non os, sed nasum volo, veniat nasus, nasaliter in Curiam, ut faciat homagium nasale.—O placide hoh, placide. O, oh, oh.—An est signum?—Oh clementer, signum est, sat est, oh oh.

Hudibras, I, II, 973:

To rouse him from lethargic dump,
He tweak'd his nose; with gentle thump
Knock'd on his breast, as if 't had been
To raise the spirits lodg'd within.
They, waken'd with the noise, did fly
From inward room to window eye;
And gently opening lid, the casement,
Look'd out, but yet with some amazement.
This gladdened Ralpho much to see,
Who thus bespoke the Knight; quoth he,
Tweaking his nose, You are, great Sir,
A self-denying conqueror;

Hudibras, III, I, 1155:

There's no way to reduce him thence
But twinging him by th' ears or nose.

Word-play upon the legal terms *junctura* or *jointure* and *issue* is a marked feature in both Ignoramus and Hudibras.

Ignoramus, Sc. I, 5:

Dabo tibi bonam juncturam: faciam ames me plus et plus. Audi juncturam tuam.

See further Scenes III, 2: IV, 9: IV, 11.

Hudibras, II, III, 515:

Or great estate.—Quoth Ralpho, A jointure,
Which makes him have so hot a mind t' her.

Hudibras, III, I, 995:

These are the everlasting fruits
Of all your passionate love-suits,
Th' effects of all your amorous fancies
To portions and inheritances;
Your love-sick rapture for fruition
Of dowry, Jointure and tuition;

Compare further Hudibras, I, III, 312, also Hudibras, III, I, 1190.

Ignoramus, Sc. II, 7:

Ign.—Oh bene est. Cum junxistis issue.

Tri. Issue? quid malum nunc dicam, immo Domine, Domine issue.

Hudibras, II, I, 737:

Quoth he, If you'll join issue on 't,
I'll give you satisfactory account;

Compare also Hudibras II, I, 410.

SUMMARY OF INFLUENCES UPON HUDIBRAS FROM IGNORAMUS AND OTHER SOURCES.

We have observed above, pp. 71–72, that nearly all literature critics discount the influence of Don Quixote upon Hudibras. In addition to authorities already quoted Encyclopedia Britannica Vol. IV, p. 589 says: “The first notion of the book, and only the first notion, Butler undoubtedly received from Don Quixote.” This statement seems to me to sum up the whole matter. The device of equipping a mock-Knight with a miserable horse, old rusty weapons, of giving him an ignorant squire who debates and disputes with his Knight (in Don Quixote in reference to Knight-errantry in Hudibras in reference to Religion) and of sending these laughable companions forth to encounter enemies who thwart all their plans and cover them with shame; the device of flying stones, and rude pummelings; is what I should designate, the ‘first notion’ of both works, and this is the sum and substance of Butler’s indebtedness to Don Quixote. I presume this is all that Mr. Garnett

wishes to express when he says, "The machinery is closely modelled upon Don Quixote" (see above, p. 72). The characters and purposes of Don Quixote and Hudibras are entirely dissimilar. The ideas, style, and language of the two works are also entirely independent of each other. No adventure or incident in Hudibras bears more likeness to Don Quixote than one adventure in Don Quixote bears to another. Of any incident in Hudibras the most we can say of it is that it is Quixotic, that is, after the manner of Don Quixote.

Although I have referred in notes to several points of possible similarity between *Satyre Menippée* and Hudibras; nevertheless, following the precedent of all the principal historians of English literature, I pass by this influence as an insignificant one. The similarity of none of the incidents is very great, and the general plan and form of the two works are totally different. Hudibras is a narrative poem; *Satyre Menippée* consists of a series of harangues written in prose interspersed with short poems. In these there is not one principal figure as in Hudibras but several. The two works are alike principally in this, that they are both politico-religious satires, full of the spirit of mockery and scorn.

As the prototype of Hudibras, the large, corpulent old sinner I have proposed in the foregoing notes Shakespeare's figure of Falstaff.¹

If Butler derived the first notion for his composite picture of Hudibras from Don Quixote, and if he derived from Falstaff the outward form, the figure, the licentious fool-character of Hudibras; he derived from Ignoramus his legal character, his pedanticism and his jargon-speaking tendency. Of Butler's indebtedness to Ignoramus for the characterization and action of his poem we may summarize in brief the observed points of our foregoing comparison. We have observed that both Ignoramus and Hudibras are pedantic, foolish, conscienceless, legal characters, who use a common jargon; both are despisers of academic learning: both are sensual lovers, who propose to marry for money; both direct letters to their ladies couched in legal

¹ For this suggestion I am indebted to Professor Wolfgang Keller.

phrase; both make oaths which they do not hesitate to violate. Both these mock-heros are thwarted in their passionate love-suit in practically the same manner. They are alarmed by the gelder's horn, imprisoned, reported to be possessed of evil spirits, exorcised and questioned as to their many sins and finally, when defeated, both threaten to or do appeal to law for justice. Both these men have also attendants, who like Sancho Panza are in a manner faithful to their masters, who, nevertheless, are at variance with them in their views and wrangle with them and who then, unlike Sancho Panza betray the masters into their enemies' hands and are themselves cast into prison.

Ignoramus and Hudibras are opposed also by about the same number of men and women, between whom in the foregoing comparison the following correspondences have been observed. Rosabella of Ignoramus and the widow of the poem Hudibras are the objects of the sensuality and greed of the two mock-heros; Polla of Ignoramus and Trulla of Hudibras are both lascivious viragos, who chastize vigorously their pretended lovers, who are the means of placing them in confinement, and who then report them to be possessed. Trico and Talgol are both tricksters and leaders of intrigue. Cola in Ignoramus and Colon in Hudibras are both of the priestly order. Fidicen in Ignoramus and Crowdero, the fiddler, in Hudibras are both the victims of abuse. Vince and Orsin both show their detestation of the respective heroes by throwing stones at them. Also the horse of Hudibras shows greater likeness to the hobby-horse of Ignoramus than to Rozinante of Don Quixote. In Ignoramus and Hudibras both horses are alike strays, which are advertised; both are monsters, half man, half horse; both are described in similar terms; both are fleet racers; both are ferocious kickers; both are for sale. The claim is not here made that these incidents and characteristics were drawn solely from Ignoramus and were uncontaminated with other sources, not here mentioned. We have seen above p. 84 how Butler took the figure of the astronomer from Mr. Tompkin's comedy entitled *Albuzmazar, the Astrologer*, surrounded him with furies and hobgoblins and then causes them to perform a service very similar

to that which Cola and his company performed upon Ignoramus. Dr. Johnson is again right when he says: "He (Butler) is found not only to have traveled the beaten road, but the by-paths of literature": As the picture of Hudibras is a composite, so is the entire work a contamination of various sources. But Ignoramus is the source to which Butler most frequently returned for novel incidents and characterization, when he wished to relieve the monotony of and put a stop to the tiresome disputes of Hudibras and Ralpho.

VII. APPENDIX.

1. AN ACCOUNT OF KING JAMES' FIRST VISIT TO CAMBRIDGE.¹

Mr. Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carleton, at Turin.

My very good lord,

I am newly returned from Cambridge, whither I went some two days after I wrote you my last. The king made his entry there the seventh of this present, with as much solemnity and concourse of gallants and great men, as the hard weather and extreme foul ways would permit. The prince came along with him, but not the queen, by reason, as it is said, that she was not invited: which error is rather imputed to their Chancellor than to the Scholars, that understand not these courses. Another defect was that there were no ambassadors, which, no doubt, was upon the same reason; but the absence of women may be the better excused for default of language, there being few or none present but of the Howards, or that alliance; as the countess of Arundel, with her sister the lady Elizabeth Grey; the countess of Suffolk, with her daughters of Salisbury and Somerset; the lady Walden, and Henry Howard's wife; which were all that I remember. The lord treasurer kept there a very great port and magnificent table, with the expense of a thousand pounds a day, as is said, but that seems too large an allowance; but sure his provisions were very great, besides plenty of presents, and may be in some sort estimated by his proportion of wine, whereof he spent twenty-six tun in five days. He lodged and kept his table at St. John's college, but his lady and her retinue at Magdalen college, whereof his grandfather Audley was founder. The king and prince lay at Trinity college, where the plays were represented; and the hall so well ordered for room, that above two thousand persons were conveniently placed. The first night's entertainment was a comedy, and acted by St. John's men, the chief part consisting of a counterfeit Sir Edward Ratcliffe, a foolish tutor of physic, which proved but a lean argument; and though it were larded with pretty shews at the beginning and end, and with somewhat too broad speech for such a presence, yet it was still dry. The second night was a comedy of Clare hall, with the help of two or three good actors from other houses, wherein David Drummond, in a Hobby-horse, and Brakin, the recorder of the town, under the name of Ignoramus, a common lawyer, bare great parts. The thing was full of mirth and variety, with many excellent actors

¹ Hawkins edit. Ignoramus, p. xxvi ff.

(among whom the lord Compton's son, though least, was not worst) but more than half marred with extreme length. The third night was an English comedy, called *Albumazar*, of Trinity college's action and invention; but there was no great matter in it more than one good clown's part. The last night was a Latin pastoral, of the same house excellently written, and as well acted; which gave great contentment, as well to the king as to the rest. Now this being the state of their plays, their acts and disputations fell out much after the same manner; for the divinity act was performed reasonably well, but not answerable to the expectation; the law and physic acts stark naught; but the philosophy act made amends, and indeed was very excellent, in so much that the same day the bishop of Ely sent the moderator, the answerer, the varier or prevaricator and one of the repliers, that were all of his house, twenty angels a piece. Now for orations and concios ad clerum, I heard not many, but those I did were extraordinary, and the better for that they were short. The university orator, *Nethersole*, though he be a proper man and think well of himself, yet he is taxed for calling the prince *Jacobissime Carole*; and some will needs add, that he called him *Jacobule* too, which neither pleased the king nor any body else. But sure the king was exceedingly pleased many times both at the plays and disputations (for I had the hap to be for the most part within hearing) and often at his meals he would express as much. He visited all the colleges, save two or three, and commends them beyond Oxford; yet I am not so partial, but therein I must crave pardon not to be of his opinion. Though I endured a great deal of penance by the way for this little pleasure, yet I would not have missed it, for that I see thereby the partiality of both sides; the Cambridge men pleasing and applauding themselves in all, and the Oxford men as fast condemning and detracting all that was done; wherein yet I commended *Corbet's* modesty, whilst he was there; who being seriously dealt withal by some friends to say what he thought, answered, that he had left his malice and judgment at home, and came thither only to commend.

Paul Tomson, the gold-clipper, hath his pardon; and not only so, but is absolved a *poena et culpa*; whereby he keeps his livings, and never came to trial; and I heard he had the face to appear in the town whilst the king was there.

Sir Arthur Ingram is in a sort *desurranné*; for *Sir Marmaduke Dorrell* is appointed to keep the table, and dispatch the business of the Cofferer, and he only to retain the name till *Michaelmas*, that the accounts may be made up: and in the mean time order taken, that he may be reimbursed of such monies as he hath lawfully laid out, or can challenge in the cause.

Old Sir John Cutts is lately dead, and here is such a speech of the lord Rosse; but there is no great credit given to it, because it comes only out of the low Countries. Your nephew Carleton is arrested with the smallpox, which hindered his journey to Cambridge.

I had almost forgotten, that all the courtiers went forth masters of Arts at the king's being there; but few or no doctors, save only Younge; which was done by mandate, being son to Sir Peter, the king's school-master. The vice-chancellor and university were exceeding strict in that point, and refused many importunities of great men; among whom was Mr. Secretary, that made great means for Mr. Westfield: but it would not be: neither the king's intreaty for John Dun would prevail: yet they are threatened with a mandate, which if it come, it is like they will obey, but they are resolved to give him such a blow withal, that he were better be without it. Indeed the bishop of Chichester, vice-chancellor, hath been very stiff, and carried himself very peremptory that way; wherein he is not much to be blamed, being a matter of more consequence than was at first imagined. He did his part every way, as well in moderating the divinity act as in taking great pains in all other things, and keeping exceeding great cheer.

I have here sent you the questions in brief, for otherwise they would bear too great bulk. And so I commend to you the protection of the Almighty. From London, the 16th of March 1614

Your lordship's to command,

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN.

2. AN ACCOUNT OF KING JAMES THE FIRST'S VISIT, IN THE MONTH OF MAY, 1615, TO THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

Transcribed from a paper drawn up by, and in the handwriting of, Mr. James Tabor, the then Register to the University.

15 Maii 1615.

A 3 Weeks before the day early notice was given, both to the deputy vice-chancellor, and to the actors of the comedy called Ignoramus, that his majesty, at his going up to London from Thetford and Newmarket, where he had sported, was fully resolved to hear the said comedy acted again; whereupon the actors were suddenly called together, and they made speedy preparation, as well for the altering and adding something to the plot; and in the interim whilst this was prepared, certain Jesuits or priests, being to be conveyed from London to Wisbich castle, were not suffered to come through Cambridge, but by the sheriff carried over the back side of the town to Cambridge castle, where they lodged one night, which the vice-chancellor did carefully and wisely to prevent the dangers which might have ensued,

if the younger sort of students had seen them, and so by their own allurements, or persuasion of some of their adherents, drawn them either to a private conference there or at Wisbich, which also to prevent the vice-chancellor attended their coming into the castle, and then sent back all such young students as he saw there. This they perceiving offered a disputation to the vice-chancellor upon three questions, which were these:

the vice chancellor told them he knew they were to make no abode there, neither had he power from his majesty to give leave for a disputation, which might give them occasion to stay, and cause a meeting of the students, and so left them; whereupon the Papists gloried as in the victory, that they had offered to dispute, and the vice-chancellor did refuse it, and, that this might be the better known, they writ divers copies of the questions, and fastened them to boughs; and the next morning, as they went to take boat for Wisbich, they threw them over Magdalen college walls, which were brought to the vice-chancellor; whereupon the vice-chancellor certified the king what they had done, so the king, about 8 days before his coming, notified the vice-chancellor that at his coming to Cambridge he would have a disputation there of those questions. Then the vice-chancellor chose young of the university to fit the disputation which were: Mr. Roberts, Trinitatis, to answer.

Mr. Bidglante, Reginalis,	} to reply.
Mr. Cumbar, Trinitatis,	
Mr. Chappell, Xti.	

and Mr. Cecill, Johannis, to moderate this act.

Upon Saturday, the 13 Maii 1615, news was brought that his majesty would be at Cambridge that night, and that in the way he meant to hunt a buck; so at 2 of the clock the school bell and St. Mary's bells rung to call the university together; the vice-chancellor set the scholars towards Spital-End; they reached to the Armitage St. Ann, and above them up the town to Trinity college, the bachelors of arts, then the gentlemen fellow-commoners, then the senior regents and non-regents then the doctors, who stood in Trinity college gate-house: his majesty came from Thetford, whither the buck led him, and where awhile he had rested himself, and so came about four of the clock; the scholars all saluted him with 'Vivat rex.' Mr. mayor and his fraternity stood on the hill by the spital-house, where Mr. mayor, without either state or reverence, when his majesty came right against the place where he stood, stepped to his coach side, and then kneeled down, and delivered his majesty a fair pair of perfumed gloves with gold laces, and the prince another, telling his majesty that their corporation was poor, and not able to bestow any matter of

value upon his majesty, and therefore invited him to accept of those, which his majesty took and gave his hand to kiss; and so he took his horse, and rode before the king's mace-bearer to Trinity college; and then the mayor took his horse and rode before the king's mace-bearer, with his mace over his shoulder, all the rest of the company leaving him, or lacking by him, which needed not, for he had 2 footmen, tired in watchet saye, with workvelvet jackets, and the arms of the red-coats wore at the fairs sewed to them. His majesty made no stay till he came at Trinity college walk, where him and the prince and his nobility alighted their coach; and being within Trinity college, against the first rails, Dr. Gwyn, deputy vice-chancellor, made an oration to him, giving him thanks for his love to them, that he was pleased again so suddenly to come to them again, and highly extolling his majesty and virtues; the vice-chancellor and heads kneeled whilst this speech was delivering, and the king stood, the prince and nobility by him; and then, the speech ended, his majesty went towards his lodge; and then, about the middle alley, the orator made another oration, which ended, the king and prince and nobility went to their lodgings. Then the vice-chancellor took order for the placing of the university and strangers, not actors, at the lower end of the stage; the doctors, in a place next the stage, the regents and non-regents in gowns; in the body of the hall, other strangers according to their qualities, upon the scaffolds: the upper end of the hall, beyond the stage, was wholly reserved for the king and prince's followers, and for the courtiers. About 8 of the clock the play began, and ended about one: his majesty was much delighted with the play, and laughed exceedingly; and sometimes with his hands, and by words, applauded it. On Sunday, at 9 of the clock, there was a sermon in St. Mary's; at half an hour past ten the king went to Trinity chapel, where he heard prayers and an anthem, and then a clero in Trinity, made by Mr. Simpson of Trinity, which was an hour and an half long, which seemed too tedious to his majesty, and therefore he shewed some distaste, not of the clero, for it was well and learnedly performed, but that he had no care to prevent tediousity, he being wearied over-night; the clero ended, there was another anthem sung and prayers, and then his majesty went to dinner; at 3 a sermon in St. Mary's, before divers of the nobility; after dinner about 4 of the clock, his majesty went to Mr. Butler, with his nobles: the sheriff Aldered of Foulmere was very officious, and took upon him his office before his majesty, which discontenting the university, the vice-chancellor, upon notice given him, informed Mr. lord chamberlain, who, from his majesty, discharged Aldered, and told him it was his majesty's pleasure he should not carry himself then as a sheriff, for

he had not power or authority in the university, and so he slunk aside, and took his place behind, and so whilst his majesty was with Butler, where he stayed near an hour; after that his majesty went to supper. On Monday there was a congregation at seven, where good order and decorum was observed, and these orderly admitted. . . .

That about 10 the vice-chancellor and whole senate of doctors, regents and non-regents, and those of the nobility in order, attended the vice-chancellor to Trinity college in order, the regents first, 2 and 2, in state to Trinity chapel, where they seated themselves, and thither came the king and prince, and heard the act, which was learnedly performed; and at the end Mr. Cecill, the moderator, began to destroy the pleasure, he fainted the night before, and that morning, being sickly, fainted, and was carried out dead, but after a quarter of an hour recovered again; the act ended, the king went to dinner, and so, after he had made known how he was contented, suddenly departed.

The mayor, when he came into Trinity college, was put before the beadles, and the vice-chancellor went next after them, and so next before the king; and when the mayor went out, he went out without serjeant or show of his mace. (Hawkins edit. Ignoramus, p. cxix, ff.)

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.

The author of this dissertation was born at Lewisburg, Pa., U. S. A. in the year 1861, as the son of Christian Van Gundy, teacher and superintendent of schools, and his wife Caroline Eichholtz Van Gundy. The author received his early education at Bucknell Academy and College. From this Institution he received in 1887 the baccalaureate degree. From the year 1887 until 1891 he was teacher of the classical languages in Bordentown (N. J.) Military Institute; from 1891-92 he taught the classical languages in Kee Mar College at Hagerstown, Md. During the following year 1892-93 he studied classical philology and Sanskrit at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Md. From 1894 until 1902 he was teacher of languages and vice principal of the High School at Norristown, Pa. In the year 1902 he went to Germany, in order to continue there his studies in Germanic philology. He studied one semester at the Friedrich Wilhelm University in Berlin and five semesters at the Johann Friedrich University at Jena. He heard in Berlin the lectures of Prof. Brandl and Doctors Paszkowski and Pariselle. In Jena he heard lectures of Professors Keller, Michels, Goetz, Delbrück and Leitzmann. To all of these professors the author feels himself greatly indebted; but especially to Prof. Wolfgang Keller, at whose suggestion and with the counsel of whom, this dissertation was undertaken and completed.

